

University of Louisville ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository


Electronic Theses and Dissertations

5-2019

Reading the readers : analyses of Shakespearean and Cervantine characters as (dys)functional readers.

Erin Shannon O'Reilly
University of Louisville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Comparative Literature Commons](#), [Literature in English, British Isles Commons](#), [Medieval Studies Commons](#), and the [Spanish Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

O'Reilly, Erin Shannon, "Reading the readers : analyses of Shakespearean and Cervantine characters as (dys)functional readers." (2019). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 3144.
<https://doi.org/10.18297/etd/3144>

This Doctoral Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. This title appears here courtesy of the author, who has retained all other copyrights. For more information, please contact thinkir@louisville.edu.

READING THE READERS: ANALYSES OF SHAKESPEAREAN AND
CERVANTINE CHARACTERS AS (DYS)FUNCTIONAL READERS

By

Erin Shannon O'Reilly
B.A., Sewanee: The University of the South, 2012
M.A., Purdue University, 2014

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Faculty of the
College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Louisville
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
in Humanities

Department of Comparative Humanities
University of Louisville
Louisville, KY

May 2019

READING THE READERS: ANALYSES OF SHAKESPEAREAN AND
CERVANTINE CHARACTERS AS (DYS)FUNCTIONAL READERS

By

Erin Shannon O'Reilly
B.A., Sewanee: The University of the South, 2012
M.A., Purdue University, 2014

A Dissertation Approved on

April 18, 2019

by the following Dissertation Committee:

Dr. Greg Hutcheson, Director

Dr. Pamela Beattie

Dr. Hristomir Stanev

Dr. Julia Dietrich

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my dissertation chair, Dr. Greg Hutcheson, for his constant support, advice, and guidance in all things academic. I also would like to thank him for the hours of conversation that shaped this dissertation and my other projects, as well as the conversation that sparked my interests in intertextuality and dystopian fiction. I also would like to thank each of member of my committee for the support given throughout this process: Dr. Pamela Beattie for her advice on how to write a dissertation from a historian's perspective and for being a constant source of advice since I began my doctoral career; Dr. Hristomir Stanev for his stimulating classes and conversation in all things Early Modern England and for helping me prepare for the Newberry Conference, the paper for which evolved into the final chapter of this dissertation; and Dr. Julia Dietrich for agreeing to serve as outside reader and for providing commentary during the defense that helped refine the finished product. I could not have done this without any of you. Thank you!

Several members of the Department of Comparative Humanities deserve credit as well: Dr. Simona Bertacco for her help in navigating a doctoral program, for advice on teaching undergraduate courses, and for being a constant morale booster; Dr. Ann Hall for mentoring the new Graduate Teaching Assistants; Dr. Shelley Salamensky who advocated for my acceptance into the program; and Lisa Schonburg for being the backbone of the doctoral program, always ready to answer our questions and help us work through our problems.

Thank you also to Dr. Clare Sullivan and Dr. Lluís Baxauli-Olmos, Department of Classical and Modern Languages at the University of Louisville, for introducing me to translation and interpretation studies; Dr. Thomas Spaccarelli and Dr. Matthew Irvin at the University of the South for inspiring my love of Spanish and Medieval literature which eventually led me to this program; and Dr. Howard Mancing and Dr. Yonsoo Kim at Purdue University, the former of whom instilled in me my love for Don Quixote and the latter of whom taught me how to be a graduate student.

To all my friends at the University of Louisville, I cannot begin to express how much I appreciate all of you. To those in my cohort: Sarah Moffett, Treva Hodges, Kate Lafferty, Bamba Ndiaye, Elizabeth Glass, and Angie Carlson, I will always remember fondly our discussions inside and outside the classroom. Even though my dissertation went in a different direction than the one I originally debated with you all, I would not change the experience because we always supported each other. To my friends in both the Louisville Humanities doctorate and Spanish Master's programs, there are too many of you all to name, but know that I love you and I appreciate all the words of support I have received over the last four years.

Finally, thank you to my family for always being my cheerleaders: my parents, Patty and Michael O'Reilly, and my grandmother, Pat Mollett. Thank you for always being ready with moral support, a shoulder to cry on, and a hug when I needed one.

ABSTRACT

READING THE READERS: ANALYSES OF SHAKESPEAREAN AND
CERVANTINE CHARACTERS AS (DYS)FUNCTIONAL READERS

Erin Shannon O'Reilly

April 18, 2019

This dissertation is a literary analysis of select works by William Shakespeare and Miguel de Cervantes focused specifically how their characters perform the act of reading. Building on reader-response theory, it explores how both authors create interpretive communities within their works and bring them into conflict in order to foreground the dysfunctionality of particular types of reading. Characters' reading experience shapes their interaction with the world around them: while functional readers are capable of reading both among and beyond diverse interpretive communities, dysfunctional readers operate within a single interpretive community to the exclusion of other possible interpretations.

This dissertation is divided into four chapters that engage in close readings of two exemplary texts: *Don Quixote* for Cervantes and *The Tempest* for Shakespeare. Chapter One examines Cervantes's creation of multiple interpretive communities within the first six chapters of *Don Quixote*, and how Don Quixote acts as dysfunctional reader through his inability to read beyond an interpretive community of his own creation. Chapter Two jumps to Don Quixote's visit to a Barcelona print shop (Part II), where he is made aware of the complex interactions of diverse interpretive communities in the production

of the printed book. This experience promotes his own education as a functional reader, one increasingly aware of how others have made him the object of their own dysfunctional readings.

Chapter Three turns to *The Tempest*'s Prospero, who acts as a dysfunctional reader when he attempts to govern his island exclusively through the power of his books. Ironically, his functionality as both father and governor of his dukedom is restored only when he renounces his books. Chapter Four explains how two of Shakespeare's heroines (*The Tempest*'s Miranda and *Titus Andronicus*'s Lavinia) become active readers within their dramas, and by so doing model functional reading to the male readers around them. With this dissertation, I hope to lay the groundwork for more robust intertextual readings of these two Early-Modern literary masters.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	v
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Methodology: Interpretive Communities and (Dys)Functional Readers.....	5
Chapter Overview.....	12
CHAPTER ONE: SPAIN'S INTERPRETIVE COMMUNITIES AND DON QUIXOTE AS DYSFUNCTIONAL READER.....	17
Interpretive Communities in Spain and <i>Don Quixote</i>	20
Interactions with Don Quixote's Solitary Interpretive Community.....	32
The Inquisition, Literary Criticism, and Readers in the <i>Escrutinio</i>	40
CHAPTER TWO: DON QUIXOTE'S FUNCTIONAL EDUCATION AND THE PRINTING PRESS AS AN AGENT OF CHARACTER DESTABILIZATION.....	54
What is the Truth?.....	58
The Printing Press in Spain.....	63
Cervantes's Interpretive Communities and Printing.....	70
Don Quixote in the Print Shop.....	76
CHAPTER THREE: PROSPERO'S INTERPRETIVE COMMUNITY, DYSFUNCTIONAL READINGS OF MILAN AND THE ISLAND, AND BEGINNING EDUCATION.....	87
Prospero's Literary Competence and Dysfunctional Reading in Milan.....	92
The Island as a Mimic of Milan.....	98
Prospero's Continued Education.....	107
CHAPTER FOUR: SHAKESPEARE'S FEMALE PROTAGONISTS AS EDUCATORS AND FUNCTIONAL READERS.....	115
Daughter of a Book.....	120
Books and Readers in <i>Titus Andronicus</i>	135
CONCLUSION.....	148

REFERENCES.....	157
APPENDIX A: SPANISH CITATIONS FROM DON QUIXOTE.....	168
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	174

INTRODUCTION

First performed before King James I at Whitehall Palace in 1611, *The Tempest* is believed to be one of the last plays Shakespeare wrote as sole author before his death. In it, Prospero, the one-time Duke of Milan reveals to his daughter Miranda how they came to flee Milan, admitting that his love for books was cause for the flight. His brother Antonio, he explains, had taken advantage of his obsessive study of the liberal arts, obsessive to the point of reclusion, and usurped the dukedom. For Prospero, though, his library “Was dukedom large enough” (1.2.110). Scarcely a decade earlier, Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra had created another character renowned for his books and his intense love of reading: Don Quixote de la Mancha. Cervantes completed the first volume of *Don Quixote* in 1605; in it, he writes of a *hidalgo* (a member of the lesser nobility) called Alonso Quijano who, like Prospero, neglects his responsibilities so he can spend more time among his books. His obsessive reading of romances of chivalry leads to his decision to become Don Quixote, knight-errant and redeemer of chivalry throughout Spain. Strikingly, in both works libraries catalyze the central plots and so invite us to consider how Shakespeare and Cervantes represent not only books, but also, perhaps more importantly, the very act of reading.

Shakespeare utilizes the full spectrum of the word “read” throughout his works, both in the literal (consuming written material) and the metaphorical sense

(e.g. comprehending the motives of other characters). Examples of those who read literally include Ferdinand reading out loud edicts in *Love's Labor's Lost*, Imogen reading herself to sleep in *Cymbeline*, or the multitude of characters who read their letters. Occasionally, the Bard will even include a stage direction that a particular character should enter onstage with a book, such as when Polonius encounters Hamlet in Act II just before the players arrive. The act of reading can provide significant clues as to each person's individual character, not to mention their level of discretion. In both *Titus Andronicus* and *Love's Labor's Lost*, women demonstrate their greater discretion by reading something correctly when the men's readings prove ineffectual. Even those with high intellects, most notably Prospero, forget how to read anything but books.

As for Cervantes, one may argue that Parts One and Two of *Don Quixote* (Part II appears in 1615) function as a comprehensive critique of different types of reading. Examples of literal reading include Quijano's friend, the curate, reading aloud a short story he finds at an inn, and Alonso Quijano's hours spent in his vast library, absorbed in his tales of chivalry, knights, and damsels-in-distress. He reads to the point that he "perdía el juicio" (72) or "lost his wits"¹ after lying awake for many nights in an attempt to puzzle out the books. Metaphorical readers include the barber and the curate, who read *Don Quixote* in order to deduce the best way to cure him, and the innkeeper who knights him and who believes him mad, but still attempts to instill some common sense into him. In Part II, literal reading results in the metaphorical, as *Don Quixote* confronts his own

¹ All English translations of the *Quixote*: Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de. *Don Quixote*. Translated by John Ormsby. W.W. Norton & Co., 1981. I will include occasional additions and/or substitutions from the Grossman edition (these will be noted in parentheses and footnotes). Original Spanish citations located in Appendix A: Murillo, Luis Andrés. *El ingenioso hidalgo Don Quijote de la Mancha I/II*. Clásicos Castalia, 2010.

story almost immediately. Part I circulates as a printed book within Part II's narrative, and the characters whom Don Quixote meets all have previously read his story, a narrative technique which no author had previously attempted.

Naturally, we cannot discuss Early Modern reading culture without acknowledging how it was impacted by innovations in print, beginning with the introduction of movable type into Europe in the mid-fifteenth century. The sixteenth and early-seventeenth centuries saw an epistemological shift as print culture grew in popularity and books became more easily accessible on the market.² As movable type allowed greater production and circulation of texts, readers gained access to more varied sources of knowledge, as well as entertained themselves with more types of popular novels. Even though manuscript culture had by no means become obsolete, print broadened the reading public beyond simply the elites who could afford it. In Spain, printed material narrowed the class divide, allowing not only for the lower classes to afford to buy a book, but also allowed stories from each social class to mix³. In England, the press introduced new methods of communication to the British Isles, mostly by new words introduced into the lexicon from imported books. However, since not everyone could understand the written word, the press, at first, only more sharply distinguished the literate from the illiterate, before eventually leading to a standardized English language and increased literacy rates

² In *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe*, Elizabeth Eisenstein explains the diffusion of printing throughout Europe, charts the increase in print shops in the major cities, and comments how printing became an amalgamation of different jobs under one roof, jobs which previously had been done in separate guilds. Roger Chartier analyzes the dynamic between oral, scribal, and print cultures, and which ones maintained a level of authority. Adrian Johns and D.W. Cruickshank examine how printing impacted the book trade in England and Spain respectively, with Johns also studying printing's credibility and Cruickshank studying printers' output. Peter Burke charts the growth of intellectual property in connection with individualism, caused by an outbreak in printed work.

³ Nalle, Sara T. "Literacy and Culture in Early Modern Castile." *Past & Present*, no. 125, 1989, pp. 65-96.

in the middle class.⁴ Two centuries earlier, owning a book (in the form of a manuscript) demonstrated sophistication, prestige, and a certain level of intellect. Sarah Malfatti claims, “Whereas in the past the simple possession of a book signified a cultural superiority, now possession alone is no longer significant *per se*. It is the use of the book itself, whether in a conventional or extraordinary way, and the properties of the printed object (whether elaborate, or unrefined) that now hold this function” (95).

While both Alonso Quijano and Prospero use their books in extraordinary ways, the end result is far from the cultural superiority that Malfatti posits. Reading drives the former to absorb an entire genre into his being to the point of lunacy, while the latter uses his bookish knowledge to create a second, ultimately unsustainable, dukedom upon the island.⁵ They become in essence dysfunctional readers in that their reading impedes their capacity to read beyond their bookish utopias and ultimately compromises their ability to function normally in society. Don Quixote, by reading and rereading all the books in his extensive library, embodies the characteristics of the heroes within them, and sets out to revive the old order of chivalry. However, by doing so, he forgets how to read and sacrifices his principal identity as reader. Prospero secludes himself in an impressive library similar to Don Quixote’s, thereby becoming one with the subject material as well, but also allowing his brother to usurp his kingdom. In a similar move to the knight, Prospero also forgets how to read the world around him, which leads to his downfall in Milan and potentially to a second ruin on the island as well.

⁴ Ford, Wyn. “The Problem of Literacy in Early Modern England.” *History*, vol. 78, no. 252, 1993, pp. 22-37.

⁵ While likely that both men possess both manuscript and print books (Malfatti herself claims that a manuscript library the size of Don Quixote’s would be impossible), I am more interested in how the characters use the books and how those books define their behavioral patterns.

I will argue that Shakespeare and Cervantes develop many of their characters as readers – at times functional and at times dysfunctional – in order to express their own anxieties about reading culture, anxieties occasioned by the rapid increase in book circulation which in turn led not only to wider circles of readership, but also to a wider array of communities of readers. Alonso Quijano and Prospero represent an extreme such community when they engage exclusively with books and forget how to interpret. Their actions as dysfunctional readers – in essence little more than the sum of the books they have read – compel others to interpret them in turn, setting in motion a complex negotiation between interpretive communities that ultimately allow for their restoration as functional readers.

Methodology: Interpretive Communities and (Dys)Functional Readers

We must center the comparison between Prospero and Alonso Quijano on how each would be expected to interact with the book as opposed to how they actually do interact with it. By engaging some of the terms of reader-response theory, we may observe how Shakespearean and Cervantine characters function or dysfunction as readers.⁶ The readers I discuss in this project belong to different interpretive communities, groups that determine how they read texts and, more importantly, each other. The question we must

⁶ Previous reader-response criticism already shows large interest in Early Modern England: Stephen B. Dobranski examines blank spaces in incomplete works by Shakespeare's contemporaries, such as Sir Philip Sidney and Ben Jonson, to answer questions about emerging "autonomous authors" and "active readers" (6). Terence Hawkes argues that Shakespeare's plays have no meaning but that which their readers/viewers extract from them, while the noted reader-response theorist, Wolfgang Iser, uses *As You Like It* as an artifact to show how literature identifies its readers' expectations, inclinations, "and eventually our overall makeup" (viii). Despite its metatextual structure, *Don Quixote* has generated little reader-response scholarship. John Skinner compares eighteenth-century readers' attitudes about *Don Quixote* to those of readers today; the former readers viewed the novel as something everyone should enjoy, whereas today's readers see it as either "a distant childhood memory...or a familiar but inexhaustible quarry for critic and theorist" (45). Elizabeth Spiller uses the Sierra Morena episode of Part I to argue how each character, whether literate or illiterate, becomes a reader of romance, while Ingo Berensmeyer treats *Don Quixote* as an artifact to "connect the question of fictionality to the relation between literary communication and its users" (626).

ask is to what types of interpretive communities do the characters belong, and do their interpretations reveal dysfunctions as readers?

Stanley Fish defines an interpretive community as

...those who share interpretive strategies not for reading (in the conventional sense) but for writing texts, for constituting their properties and assigning their intentions. In other words, these strategies exist prior to the act of reading and therefore determine the shape of what is read rather than, as is usually assumed, the other way around. (171)

Fish makes a distinction between reading communities – those who simply read but do not engage – and interpretive communities – those who write the texts as they read them. Every reader belongs to at least one, sometimes more than one, interpretative community, each of which uses social convention to determine a text's meaning. Literary analysis cannot take place immediately following the reading, but rather must happen actively during the reading. The reader then “is identified not as a free agent, making literature in any old way, but as a member of a community whose assumptions about literature determine the kind of attention he pays and thus the kind of literature ‘he’ ‘makes’” (11). Fish uses the word “make” in a specific way, arguing that the author does not so much write the text as the reader does. Authorial intent, while occasionally mentioned in Fish's writing as a form of reader-response criticism, becomes secondary to the readers' intent, and the readers' creative powers shape the text and shape the readers' reactions to the text.

For Fish, a presumed text cannot have meaning by itself; no matter what message Cervantes may communicate in a particular episode of *Don Quixote*, any meaning within

that episode does not exist unless an audience sits down and reads it. Fish then uses this definition to explain the paradox of how two or more human beings may think along similar lines, but still reach different interpretations of the same text (e.g. how one man sees a group of giants while his companion sees windmills). Likewise, how can one person interpret one text in different ways? Different communities approach texts based on particular ideologies and the number of texts involved, as well as content; Fish provides the example of a faith-based group possessing multiple scriptures vs. a separate faith with only one scripture. The former employs a variety of interpretive strategies depending on which of their many texts they read at a given moment, whereas the latter only uses the one strategy. Even multiple people within the first group might arrive at different interpretations of the same treatise, so that each group (and each person within the group) defines the “truth” according to their own perceptions.⁷ Why would those multiple people interpret in different ways? Fish’s answer is that they simultaneously belong to other communities, and so will shape the same document in multiple ways. Truth becomes a malleable concept instead of one in accordance with fact.⁸ The text itself cannot claim any stability – stagnation, yes (the physical document will never change), but no stability since it can generate so many varied analyses. Instead, the stability comes

⁷ Fish also raises a point of debate in what can be considered a “true text.” Each of the two above communities would consider their own texts the “true” one, whether that be a group of interrelated books or just the one work. The debate would then follow, “The first community will accuse the members of the second of being reductive, and they in turn will call their accusers superficial” (171). In their own way, both texts would – or should – be considered true ones, since each interpretive strategy permits different opinions to arise, which therefore permits debate among different groups of people. Does that mean that Don Quixote’s literal reading of chivalric novels would be a true reading, even if the rest of Spain thinks him insane?

⁸ Each reader shapes truth according to his or her own definition. Truth for Don Quixote is preparing to battle against giants; that they are actually windmills is irrelevant. Cervantes scholar James Parr notes the knight’s type of perspectivism, or “significant insights into the nature of reality” (225). Don Quixote’s readings give him insight into the nature of reality as defined by chivalric novels, and we as readers “are the purveyors of that wisdom” (Parr 225).

from the interpretive strategies used by each subsequent group that reads the text; in essence, neither the text nor the community can generate stability, but the reading methods can.⁹ Debates over different strategies begin after every person within a community uses their innate ability to reason in order to learn the strategies. The only certainty is that reading continues and each group will employ its particular strategies to constantly write and rewrite its current reading material. Both Shakespeare and Cervantes situate their characters in a landscape of constantly shifting interpretive communities, but the characters' own communities fail to shift and evolve as well; conflict arises and neither Don Quixote nor Prospero can reconcile their community with those around them.

One other factor unites the readers in this study: they not only belong to interpretive communities, but we may define them as either functional or dysfunctional readers. For the purposes of this study, I rely on Stanley Fish's concept of the "informed reader," with a few modifications of my own.¹⁰

The "informed reader," according to Fish,

⁹ Even so, Fish is quick to point out that said stability is only temporary. Since communities are constantly in flux, most particularly with members moving between them or how in vogue the topic might be, the explanations and debates continue as new people enter and leave the group. The community remains just stable enough for its interpretive strategies to function and for new people to join the debate, but changes enough so the debate will never actually stop (172).

¹⁰ Iser's "implied reader" is a "transcendental model which makes it possible for the structured effects of literary texts to be described" (*The Act of Reading*, 34); in other words, someone who searches for gaps in the text and attempts to generate meaning by inserting their own interpretations. Riffaterre's "super reader" is someone so well versed in a particular genre, language, or structure that they begin to anticipate what rhetorical or archetypal devices the author will implement next (78). Prince's "ideal reader" is one who understands the author's every intention and meaning. Certainly for Cervantes, and likely for Shakespeare as well, no such reader exists. Both men may have "virtual readers" (a.k.a. the audience each has in mind when writing), but no ideal reader who understands their stylistic and narrative choices. Likewise, if Prospero functioned as an ideal reader, he could easily move from reading his books to reading Antonio, and easily understand Antonio's intentions and meanings. Fish's "informed reader" suits the purpose of this study because it gives the characters more responsibility over their own actions as readers; rather than possessing the innate ability to understand an author's meaning, they must learn how to develop their own literary and social competences to keep themselves apprised of events surrounding them.

...is someone who (1) is a competent speaker of the language out of which the text is built up; (2) is in full possession of “the semantic knowledge that a mature...listener brings to his task of comprehension,” including the knowledge (that is, the experience, both as a producer and comprehender) of lexical sets, collocation probabilities, idioms, professional, and other dialects, and so on; and (3) has *literary* competence. That is, he is sufficiently experienced as a reader to have internalized the properties of literary discourses, including everything from the most local of devices (figures of speech, and so on) to whole genres. (48)

Going by this definition alone, we may see how both Don Quixote and Prospero should function as informed readers, and I choose Fish’s term for this exact reason. Both speak the languages in which their books are written, both possess semantic knowledge, and both have their own types of literary competence. What distinguishes these two characters from other readers is how they embody their readings. Each belongs to an isolated interpretive community of his own creation; Don Quixote is the physical embodiment of chivalric romance, while Prospero’s books become an extension of himself that he uses to perform the island’s magic. In this case, we might call them hyper-informed readers, or readers who construct their identities and worldviews exclusively around their books and reading strategies. However, a hyper-informed reader may easily become a dysfunctional reader, or a reader who exists and functions normally within their own interpretive community but cannot do so outside it. Throughout Part I, Don Quixote expects the world around him to conform to his perspective; every contact between his community and another ends in conflict, and every time he loses, he justifies it with an

explanation found in chivalric novels (such as an enemy enchanter). While Sancho Panza only sees windmills, Don Quixote sees the giants he must vanquish, and all the while, the outside reader observes as the two communities come into conflict with each other. When Sancho argues with his master, Don Quixote responds “Bien parece que no estás cursado en esto de las aventuras: ellos son gigantes...” (129) [It seems clear to me that thou art not well-versed in the matter of adventures: these are giants (58)]. The word *cursado* references Sancho’s lack of book knowledge regarding chivalric romance, knowledge Don Quixote expresses at every opportunity, thereby reinforcing his dogmatic insistence that his books (novels) act as sole arbiters of truth.

Prospero’s books become akin to his dukedom, so much so that he delegates all his duties to Antonio and never leaves his study until Gonzalo smuggles him out of Milan. Similarly to Don Quixote, Prospero cannot function outside of his study. However, while on the island, Prospero never expresses a similar moment in which he defends his books as arbiters of truth. The corresponding moment comes when Caliban remarks to Stephano and Trinculo how dependent Prospero remains on his books, and that to usurp the duke, they need only acquire the material objects: “First to possess his books; for without them/He’s but a sot, as I am, nor hath not/One spirit to command: they all do hate him/As rootedly as I. Burn but his books. (3.2.92-95). This passage demonstrates how Prospero clings to his solitary community, even as he begins to transition back from dysfunctional to functional reader, and also acknowledges Caliban’s recognition of the books as a source of Prospero’s power.

Neither Prospero nor Don Quixote can function normally within their respective societies, therefore, they must learn how to reintegrate their reading strategies back into

society and become functional readers. The conflict with other interpretive communities ultimately results in the protagonists' restoration of functionality, a restoration we might also call an education in functional reading and practical interpretive communities.

Cervantes scholar – Perry J. Powers – describes experience as an event that:

...is significant or trivial to the degree that it has meaning for us, and meaning is largely determined by a sense of reality, which judges the experience to be more or less real...for it is what we hold to be real that determines the direction of our growth. Education, then, consists largely in an ever growing awareness of the complexity of reality, in the ability to distinguish between reality and appearance, to treat appearance for what it is, and to bring our lives into harmony with the real. But our concept of reality is likely to be static unless there are suggestions and perceptions which come to us from some source outside ourselves. Thus a book whose very life derives from the conflict between reality and appearance could have considerable significance in the process that we call "education."

(Powers 288)

Education factors into that experience, so that the experience transcends the author's intention, but still allows the reader to maintain a balance between reality and appearance. Educated readers, then, engage with other sources outside their community's chosen text, and as such, become functional readers.

Both Fish and Powers agree that in order to be called a text, the text must change. Texts only grow stagnant when interpretation stops and subsequent conversations within and among communities stop. They remain relevant if they change as their readerships

change. Shakespeare and Cervantes seem to imply that the same holds true for Prospero and Don Quixote: they become relevant through their engagement with multiple, at times conflicting, interpretive communities.

Chapter Overview

I will argue that Shakespeare and Cervantes create in Prospero and Don Quixote dysfunctional readers who learn how to operate as functional readers through a combination of their own evolving literary competencies and the pressure applied by other interpretive communities. I will devote two chapters each to Cervantes and Shakespeare, each demonstrating the lineal movement from dysfunctional to functional in their respective works. Each pair of chapters will follow the same structure: the first chapter will explain the work's interpretive communities and the second will articulate the protagonists' education as functional reader.

The first chapter examines interpretive communities and material books in Part I of the *Quixote*, with specific reference to Alonso Quijano's library as the site of negotiation between communities. Cervantes introduces three types of interpretive communities within the first six chapters alone: 1) Alonso Quijano and his friends; 2) his housekeeper and his niece who fear his particular books; and 3) the people whom Alonso Quijano (now transformed into Don Quixote) meets on his first sally. We see how Quijano loses his sanity over his hyper-informed reading, becomes the chivalrous knight once he actively stops reading, and then attempts to force the world around him into his interpretation. Simultaneously, the people he meets learn how to read and interpret him in an almost abusive reading (either to laugh at him or take advantage of him), or they ignore him and thus do not engage in reading at all. This first sally culminates in the

effort of his two friends, the barber and the curate, to cure him of his book status and restore his identity as reader, by subjecting his personal library to intense scrutiny and burning the offending books. Cervantes can then use Don Quixote as a tool to criticize both the books he parodies and the people who read them, including, potentially, the ones reading his own work.

The second chapter explores how Part II of *Don Quixote* establishes new conflicts between interpretive communities, this time between Don Quixote and readers of Part I. Specifically, the chapter will examine his education about those communities, which begins when he learns that Part I's adventures have been recorded in a novel. Sansón Carrasco, the duke and the duchess, and other readers all expect to see the knight immortalized in Part I, and try to mold him into their expectations of him. As other communities become the hyper-informed readers of his story, he simultaneously detaches himself from that same story. By resisting their expectations at every turn, he is forced to learn how to negotiate among diverse interpretive communities. When he visits a Barcelona print shop in Chapter 62, he sees the machine that gave birth to his dreams of knight-errantry and subsequently his own originary story. The press catalyzes his transition back to functional reader, showing him that the readings he has encountered throughout Part II will continue and that his community cannot exist concurrently with the readers of Part I. He becomes a functional reader again only after the literary trauma inflicted upon him shows how dysfunctional he truly is.

The third chapter will shift from Cervantes to Shakespeare, and analyze interpretive communities in *The Tempest*. Since books confront the outside reader quite frequently in *Don Quixote*, reading Shakespeare through the same methodology makes us search for

the books that cause hyper-informed reading. This chapter examines interactions between Prospero's solitary community and others around him, both in Milan and on the island. Prospero absorbs himself so deeply in his books that he fails to read the one truly important text, his own brother, thereby proving that his community cannot sustain itself in Milan. Years later, Prospero nearly faces the same event on the island first when Caliban attempts to rape Miranda and again when Caliban joins forces with Stephano and Trinculo to usurp him. However, Caliban fails because Prospero acts as the perfect functional reader while on the island: his books grant him power to control the sprites, the elements, and Caliban, and his magic permeates the entire landscape. He realizes that while his community functions on the island, he must renounce it if he wants to live as a functional reader/duke in Milan. When Prospero departs from the island, he relinquishes his books, seemingly shedding his skin as an enchanter to take his rightful place as duke. In so doing, he acknowledges his readiness to become a functional reader within Italian society.

However, if the printing press completes Don Quixote's education to functional reader, then what catalyst begins Prospero's journey back to functionality? The answer is his daughter Miranda. The final chapter will analyze female readers in two of Shakespeare's plays, in which women behave as functional readers in order to educate the men in their familial interpretive communities. Beginning with *The Tempest*, we see Prospero and Caliban attempt to influence Miranda's status as reader, each in his own way. When Caliban attempts to rape Miranda, he hopes to turn her into a silent book that he can rewrite to his suit his own narrative. Prospero even attempts to form Miranda into a reader after himself, something she allows in the first act but resists upon meeting

Ferdinand. She learns how to read him, meets other men later the same day, and begins to break away from her father's interpretive community. She identifies herself as a reader with her own agency, something Caliban threatened to steal from her and which Ferdinand can sense in his conversations with her. All the while, she acts as the catalyst that motivates Prospero to return to functional reader status himself. Her agency as reader invites us to examine the only other Shakespearean heroine with direct access to a library, *Titus Andronicus*'s Lavinia. The rape of Lavinia takes center stage within the story, eliminating her ability to communicate and thereby forcing her to do so via a book. She relates to the physical book – her nephew's copy of Ovid – as an instrument of communication, and with the text as one of interpretation. She reads her father and uncle correctly, but they either cannot or will not read her, therefore she must use the book to teach them how to read properly. In the end, the women no longer need any books because they have broken away from the objects and become readers; this, in turn, grants them an agency no man can take from them.

Each chapter will emphasize either a moment or a play in which the characters express their identities as (dys)functional readers when they engage with the interpretive communities around them. In so doing, I will draw conclusion about how Shakespeare's and Cervantes's representations of readers reflect anxieties about readerships due to increased book production. By reading Cervantes through a Shakespearean lens and vice versa, we may make previously unexplored connections between characters, their relationships with books and their identities as readers. By comparing two of literature's most iconic book-focused protagonists, I hope to bring a fresh perspective to Cervantes

and Shakespeare studies and bridge the cultural gap between these two seventeenth-century literary masters.

CHAPTER ONE
EARLY-MODERN SPAIN'S INTERPRETIVE COMMUNITIES AND DON
QUIXOTE AS DYSFUNCTIONAL READER

Published in 1605, Part I of *Don Quixote* overwhelms its reader with the physical presence of books and readers, most especially Alonso Quijano himself. Scholars and readers have long interpreted the *Quixote* as a parody of romances of chivalry; Manuel Durán and Fay Rogg comment how Cervantes “delighted in experimenting with different narrative models popular in the sixteenth century, at times improving them, parodying them, imitating them, and reinventing them” (43), with chivalric romance, pastoral, and picaresque forming the core three genres he most often imitated. Edward Friedman calls Don Quixote “a character who seeks to actualize verbal signifiers” (“Books Errant” 43), one who uses the trappings of chivalry to impose his worldview upon his surroundings. In Part I, he sallies forth twice into the Spanish countryside, in search of adventures and wrongs to right. Said adventures include tilting at the infamous windmills, fighting with a herd of sheep, and being carted home in a cage at the end of the book, among many others. He routinely converts ordinary objects into rare chivalric artifacts; for instance, a simple barber’s basin becomes a famous knight’s golden helmet. Part II, published in 1615, sees Don Quixote continue his quest upon learning that a novel has been published about his adventures. From that point onward, he and Part II’s other characters interact

with two material books: print copies of Part I and print copies of another book published in 1614, an apocryphal sequel to *Don Quixote* written by Alonso Fernández de Avellaneda (see the next chapter).

I argue that Cervantes uses Part I to critique popular seventeenth-century reading material, and uses Spain's variation of "pop culture" as a means of establishing conflict between interpretive communities. I intend to examine only the first sally, in which an innkeeper dubs Don Quixote officially a knight and which establishes how his community creates conflict, and the episode when the knight's friends burn his personal library, which establishes why the conflict exists. In these, the novel's first six chapters, Cervantes foregrounds Don Quixote's identity as a reader. If we remember the definitions of informed and hyper-informed readers, Don Quixote is the informed reader regarding his own chivalric worldview, and his literary competence suffices to read the people and events around him as characters and chivalric proceedings. However, he only assumes the identity Don Quixote after Alonso Quijano's hyper-informed reading of chivalric romance. According to the narrator, Quijano devotes so much time to his books that he neglects his estate, sells off pieces of it so that he can afford more books, and gradually loses all sense of reason. While scholars such as Ángel Rodríguez González debate how far Don Quixote blurs the line between reality and fiction,¹ I say that there is no line because he cannot exist without the fiction. His books give him the foundation to create his literary alter ego, and in so doing, he creates his own interpretive community.

¹ Rodríguez González distinguishes between two types of reality that Cervantes treats as a game within the two volumes: reality of fiction and fiction of reality. The former refers to Don Quixote's inability or unwillingness to acknowledge the boundary between reality and fiction, while the latter "genera una sensación de realidad" (162) or "generates a sensation of reality" but really is nothing more than a piece of creative fiction. He argues that Cervantes moves between these two definitions of reality, but what would these mean in terms of book studies? Specifically, how would the debate over authority between the written vs. the printed word play out?

However, he gains his new identity at the expense of the old one: not only does he renounces his previous life as a hidalgo, but he also renounces his identity as a reader of fiction, of his environment, and of other people. In essence, he renounces his identity as a functional reader; Alonso Quijano could operate within Spanish society, Don Quixote cannot. His friends hope that destroying his book collection will educate him enough to reclaim his true identities, hidalgo and reader. Even with the books gone though, they fail to persuade him because he belongs to his own interpretive community and he rejects others who introduce new interpreting strategies.

In order to understand how the first sally and the library burning demonstrate Don Quixote's presence as a dysfunctional reader, we need to answer three questions. First, what sort of reading practices and communities existed in seventeenth-century Spain, and how does this concept of interpretive communities function in Part I? How does Alonso Quijano diverge from his interpretive community to form his own around the name Don Quixote? Finally, how does the book burning scene (hereafter referred to by the Spanish term, *escrutinio*) enable Don Quixote to maintain his solitary community? As we shall see, Don Quixote appropriates the rhetoric of chivalric romance to force the reader (both inside and outside the narrative) to accept his identity. Cervantes foregrounds his protagonist's love for books, but notes the difference between personalities: Alonso Quijano interacts with the texts, while Don Quixote interacts with the books. By the time he departs from home, he no longer requires the books. Opinions regarding Don Quixote's madness derive from the contact between his solitary community and the ones that permeate the rest of the novel. Ironically since reading is the only thing that Quijano does, Don Quixote's community costs him his own ability to read.

Interpretive Communities in Spain and *Don Quixote*

In order to understand how Don Quixote's reading shapes his perspective, we must understand the reading practices prevalent in Spain during Cervantes' lifetime. Every character acts as a reader, whether that be Quijano's obsession with reading fiction as historical record, his niece who fears the act of reading and refuses to engage, or the duke and duchess of Part II who deliberately misread Don Quixote and Sancho in order to play a practical joke. How and what they read varies from person to person, depending on their social conventions and reading partners. Every character, then, becomes part of one or more interpretive communities, and their actions determine to which communities they belong.

What interpretive communities would have read Cervantes's works and what strategies would they have employed? Also, how familiar were they with his source material, primarily chivalric novels? Let us begin with their familiarity. Two centuries earlier, such works would have circulated already amongst only those who could afford to purchase a manuscript. With the invention of printing, however, all fictional genres (chivalric, pastoral, and poetry, among others) reached a broader and more socially-diverse audience.² Along with printing, increased interest in secondary education led to a surge of literacy among the social hierarchy.³ Initial increases in literacy rates predate the

² Even so, Malfatti notes a rise in manuscript production that coincided with sales of printed works, most likely due to Spain's deteriorating economy at the time. Print books may have been cheaper to purchase, but were more expensive to make since they were produced in large quantities. While all social classes bought printed works, only the upper classes still purchased manuscripts, which followed different interpretive strategies. Since interpretive strategies also govern authorial content, such as an author writing for others in a specific community, the subject matter between printed and manuscript works could and did differ substantially. The strategies that influenced print work affected what sort of content went into it, specifically what content the Inquisition permitted. Manuscripts, by contrast, did not receive the same treatment.

³ Sara Nalle provides data showing the increase in Spain's literacy rates between the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. While sixteenth-century data is limited, she does show a 35% literacy rate of men

arrival of the printing press; the machine only circulated more types of reading material at a much faster pace. Enrollment at the University of Salamanca reached its peak in 1584, when it was also noted that the number of Latin-based primary schools had increased, both in the cities and the rural villages (Nalle 74).⁴ No matter the place, “many of the new foundations were inspired by the efforts of such Catholic reformers as SS. John of Avila and Ignatius Loyola, who were determined to raise the amount and level of religious instruction available to the faithful... Whatever the means used, more Castilians than ever before were learning to read” (Nalle 76). As long as the numbers of able readers grew, interpretive communities could exist among those with book collections. Owning books on its own did not immediately correlate with literacy, and some small libraries contained less than five books. However, data taken from Cuenca’s inquisitional records shows that books did circulate amongst at least some of Spain’s rural population, with farmers and artisans possessing the most volumes.⁵ When the *vulgos* (an elitist word for the uneducated) began reading, they brought their own stories and songs with them, and booksellers responded with their own output. D.W. Cruickshank remarks how printers responded to a wider audience since “an increasingly less ‘literary’ (and less literate) public found itself interested in ‘literature’ which stimulated it enough to demand more,

living within the Diocese of Cuenca and an 8% rate among women. These numbers increase to 52% and 28% respectively in the seventeenth century. Almost no data exists for Madrid before 1600, but in 1650, records show a 69% literacy rate for men and 29% for women. Analysts must still take these numbers with a grain of salt, since most of the information comes from inquisitional records.

⁴ It should also be noted that while traditional learning methods required a child receive lessons from the village priest or sacristan, the growing number of educated children meant that laymen began acting as teachers as well. Boys learned to read in schools, from clergy and laypeople alike; girls learned to read at home, usually taught by family and friends. (Nalle 75).

⁵ According to Nalle’s research, over a survey of 91 people (both male and female) questioned by the Inquisition in Cuenca between 1560 and 1610, 26 were farmers, 14 were artisans, 9 were priests, 9 professionals (doctors, lawyers), etc. Sixty-six men could both read and write as opposed to only 17 who could just read. Of the eight women brought before them, six could read while the other two could also write. The most prevalent charges brought against them were fornication and blasphemy; of the remaining charges, one person was questioned for possessing a prohibited book.

by buying what the trade was providing” (818); printers began catering to *vulgo* audiences as well as *discretos* – those who could exercise literary judgment – in response to economic troubles. Prose fiction began to focus less on the moralizing and didactic elements and more on the entertainment. Chivalric fiction, both original Spanish works and French and Italian translations, began to flood the market, with the translations gaining more popularity since the reading public still “preferred such late medieval themes as courtly love, chivalry, *ars moriendi*, and hagiography” (Nalle 80). According to Malfatti,

By this point [the beginning of the seventeenth century], the genre had shaken off all pretence of any moralizing and idealistic purpose. It was now firmly aimed at the recreational market. The entertainment factor was founded on elements of such as the ‘marvellous’, eroticism, and hyperbole – a deliberate set of editorial strategies that underlined the new dominant role of the public in the development and circulation of new narrative and formal forms. (89)

If the entertainment factor increased due to the readers’ demands of hyperbole and the fantastic, then interpretive communities existed within all the social classes that could read and rewrite the texts based on their own knowledge of chivalry and courtly love stories. According to communications scholar, Marshall McLuhan, these antiquated stories were exactly what the public wanted:

...during the first two centuries of print, until the end of the seventeenth century, the great body of printed matter was of medieval origin. The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries saw more of the Middle Ages than had

ever been available to anybody in the Middle Ages. Then it had been scattered and inaccessible and slow to read. Now it became privately portable and quick to read...Moreover, the reading public was attuned to this earlier culture. Not only were there no modern writers at first, but they had no public ready to accept them so Febvre and Martin say (p. 420):

“Thus print facilitated the work of scholars in some fields, but on the whole one can say that it contributed nothing to hasten the adoption of theories or new knowledge.” (162)

Even though he speaks generally about printed subject matter in Western Europe, McLuhan inadvertently gives us a clue to the interpretive communities of Spain, one that Nalle’s research supports. If the reading public was indeed attuned to this earlier culture, then the interpretive communities, by necessity, possessed enough knowledge about those stories, while those who did not grow up with the stories now had the capacity to learn them by interacting with other communities. Fish reminds us that each reader undergoes the reading experience, the experience being to extract their own meaning and, in so doing, reshape the text. If the only constant is that reading continues, then the strategies change based on who reads the text, or in this case, which class reads the text. For chivalric works, a clergyman would attempt to find some moralizing factor, while laypeople of any social standing would find either moral or entertainment value, or both. One interpretive community would appreciate the poetry within a pastoral romance – a genre that mixed pastoral poetry with fictional prose – while another would contemplate the countryside with the shepherds. While the stories existed and the genres existed, what changed were the original interpretive communities, now with different classes of readers

adding their voices to the reading strategies. Humanist and intellectual literature declined because the market for them declined. Malfatti and Nalle both comment on the decreasing market for humanist literature; the former concentrates on the increased market for chivalric novels among those seeking both spiritual enlightenment and (mostly) entertainment, while the latter identifies the owners of humanist tracts as those preparing for school or the priesthood (Nalle 89). Even Cruickshank comments how quality reading material declined in the seventeenth century because “the greater public for which these printers were forced to cater was as happy as with the first-rate, and readily consumed material which the authorities considered harmful” (823). In a move similar to today’s idea of popular culture, imitations of great works sold easily since the communities that purchased them could more easily evaluate them and compare them with a genre’s masterpiece.⁶ Interpretive communities change because their members change, and rises in books and literacy numbers created new types of communities throughout Spain.

Now that we have some idea of sixteenth and seventeenth-century Spain’s interpretive communities, what such communities does Cervantes create within Part I of the *Quixote*? Since it would be possible to fill a separate book with all the communities of just Part I, for the purpose of this study, I will restrict myself to Don Quixote’s first sally. Four separate communities arise immediately within the story: 1) Alonso Quijano, the curate (also called Pero Pérez), and the barber (also called Maese Nicolás); 2) Don Quixote’s own community built around his chivalric identity; 3) Quijano’s housekeeper

⁶ We need also bear in mind that Cervantes did not begin his career with an innovative work such as *Don Quixote*. His earliest published work, *La Galatea*, was an imitation of pastoral novels, the genre second in popularity to the chivalric novel, and even he admits its lackluster elements in comparison with the epitome of pastoral literature, *La Diana*.

and his niece; and 4) the innkeeper who knights Don Quixote, as well as his guests. As to the first two, I distinguish between the protagonist's two names: Alonso Quijano does indeed participate in conversations with the barber and curate, and the three of them operate within a functional interpretive community. The knight, Don Quixote, diverges from this community, constructs his own, and acts as dysfunctional reader since he cannot incorporate differing strategies into his own. In the first sally, Don Quixote stands alone within his community; when he departs on the second sally, he begins to induct Sancho into it as well.

Beginning with the communities surrounding Don Quixote, the housekeeper and the niece fear the books so much that they barely touch them, let alone read them. The audience as readers are not properly introduced to the women until Chapter V just as Don Quixote returns home following his first sally, and both their opening dialogues slander the books. Among the housekeeper's first words are, "Miserable me! I am certain of it, and it is as true as that I was born to die, that these accursed books of chivalry he has and reads so constantly have upset his reason...To the devil and Barabbas with such books, that have brought to ruin in this way the finest mind in all La Mancha!" (46). The niece adds in more detail:

"...it was often my uncle's way to stay up two days and nights together poring over these unholy books of misadventures. After that he would fling the book away and snatch up his sword and fall to slashing the walls. When he was tired out he would say he had killed four giants like four towers; and the sweat that flowed from him when he was weary he said was the blood of the wounds he had received in battle...But I take all the

blame myself for never having told your worships of my uncle's crazy notions, that you might put a stop to them before things had come to this pass, and burn all these accursed books – for he has a great number...”

(46-47)

The women use some interesting word choices when describing the books. The housekeeper refers to her master as possessing “el más delicado entendimiento” before his books ruined his capacity to reason. The Ormsby English edition of *Don Quixote* translates the word “delicado” as “finest,” implying the best mind in all of La Mancha. However in the *Tesoro de la lengua castellana*, Covarrubias defines it as “de flaca complexion,” literally meaning thin-skinned or delicate, or in the case of a man's mind, just plain weak. The niece first describes the books as “desalmados,” which literally translated would mean soulless or unholy (the word Ormsby uses). “Desalmado” means “el que tiene una mala conciencia y no cura de vivir como hombre de razón” [he who has a bad conscience and no hope of living as a man with reason] and “descomulgado” means “apartar de la comunión de los fieles” [apart from the communion of the faithful] or basically excommunicated. The women treat the books as people with(out) consciences and read them as they would people rather than as books.

This one time when the niece lists her uncle's mental adventures provides the only clue to the women's previous contact with the books. They do not read anything written during the narrative (indeed Cervantes never actually clarifies if they know how to read), and their dialogue shows a paranoia towards these particular books after seeing Quijano's descent to madness. When the two women set foot in their master/uncle's library and see more than a hundred books, their fear escalates and they immediately beg the men to burn

the entire collection. The priest laughs at them in response, which illustrates a point of conflict between two interpretive communities. The priest and barber, who have previously engaged with each book, know which ones they should and should not burn. The women interact only with the paperbound volumes and not the texts within them, which proves not a fear of the books but a situational fear of reading. The women fear these books because they see the effect on Señor Quijano, which leads them to fear any sort of fictional text whatsoever. Considering how pious the housekeeper is and how she essentially curses the books to the devil, we may surmise that if Catholic scripture were placed in front of her, she would have no qualms about reading it. When they discover the library contains more than just chivalric novels, they refuse to believe the others are harmless and insist they burn as well. They come to their decision quickly and unanimously without further need of discussion, which helps set the parameters for their particular community, the zealous community. The women fear what power the books have over their patriarch, but the decision to destroy the books still argues its own type of interpretation.⁷ The housekeeper's pious nature leads her to see heretical material sitting in front of her, not merely works of entertainment.

The niece and housekeeper's behavior parallels that of an institutionalized interpretive communities: the Inquisition. As one of Spain's largest, if not the largest, interpretive communities, the Inquisition suppressed any text it considered heretical, or anything that

⁷ It is worth remembering also that the housekeeper and niece in no way represent the entire female reading population of Early Modern Spain. In the sixteenth century, women did play active roles in literary markets as patronesses and as writers, though Kaestle remarks that female writers generally wrote in epistolary forms, meaning they "could bypass the need for formal education, literary patronage, editors, and publishers, and they often thus circumvented the censorship of a patriarchal literary industry" (1123). These two women form their own interpretive community that fears fiction and make-believe after observing firsthand how their master/uncle responds to it. Other female communities found creative ways to read and write and began their own communities centered on letters.

spread non-Catholic thought. Daniel Eisenberg explains how in 1492, following the Christian conquest over the last Hispano-Muslim city of Granada, Cardinal Francisco Jiménez de Cisneros examined every written object within Granada's walls and set fire to them, all except the medical tracts "de la riqueza de su medicina queda el testimonio de muchos códices, único campo de su sabiduría cuya sobrevivencia se facilitaba. La complejidad de los azulejos geométricos...nos recuerda y documenta su riqueza matemática y filosófica" (109). All philosophy, logic, and anything else non-medicinal in nature was burned, ushering in the end of Hispano-Arabic Spain. Similarly, the housekeeper and the niece hope they can usher in the end of their patriarch's delusion by destroying books they may or may not have read, but consider heretical just from their existing knowledge. They possess minimal literary competence with regards to the stories, which prevents them from being called informed readers of fiction, yet even so they still possess some familiarity with the script. When they enter the library, the housekeeper remarks, "Sprinkle this room, and don't let any of the whole swarm of magicians in these books bewitch us, in revenge for our planning to banish from the world" (48). That she uses the word "encantador" or "magician" provides a clue that she knows some sort of magical character is a staple of chivalric novels, and the niece follows the script as well when she tells her uncle that an enchanter stole his books. Whether from reading or from overhearing the men's discussions, the women possess some passive knowledge regarding the novels' structure. This does not provide enough information to justify calling the women informed readers of fiction, however we may call them hyper-informed regarding inquisitional practices instead. The women become dysfunctional readers in that their community juxtaposes Don Quixote's exactly: he can

function within his chivalric community but not in Spain, while the women can function within Catholic Spain but not the fictional romances of chivalry.

Likewise, the innkeeper and the other guests within his residence do not engage directly with books during their interactions with Don Quixote, but they engage with Don Quixote himself. It may be a stretch to call anyone at the inn a reader, simply because we do not see any of them reading, and when the innkeeper enters stage right with a book, he does not read from it but rather improvises a knighting ceremony. Cervantes never explicitly states whether he reads chivalric novels or not, but we may surmise that either he has read one himself or has heard one told through the still existing oral tradition. This implies that the innkeeper belongs to a community of *vulgos* and possesses at least some familiarity with the chivalric genre. He can certainly read and write; he later pretends to read from a holy book which in fact is his account book. However, either he gleans some of the rhetoric and content from hearing his soon-to-be-knighted guest speak, or he has read enough of the genre (even one or two books would suffice) to know how to respond – likely the latter because he does provide Don Quixote with advice on being a knight-errant. To humor himself, he tells Don Quixote, “...that he was quite right in pursuing the object he had in view, and that such a motive was natural and becoming in cavaliers as distinguished as he seemed and his gallant bearing showed him to be. As for the landlord himself, in his younger days he had followed the same honorable calling, roaming in quest of adventures in various parts of the world” (34-35). The innkeeper quickly rewrites Don Quixote’s character as he reads him, seeing not the noble knight-errant, but a mad old man with delusions of a castle. His words aim to subtly insult his guest, using contemporary rhetoric as opposed to the antiquated speech Don Quixote favors and

implying that he enjoyed grandiose adventures during his youth, when said adventures consisted of visiting one brothel after another. When he knights Don Quixote, he demonstrates the little knowledge he has of the ceremony, enough to mimic a prayer and touch Don Quixote's sword to each shoulder. He belongs in an interpretive community all on his own as he still employs his own strategy to read his guest. Powers describes the episode at the inn as containing "three levels of meaning: first, Don Quixote, who perceives but one reality; second, the innkeeper, who knows that Don Quixote is mad but who pretends; and, last, the muleteer, who refuses to pretend" (295-296), but if we substitute the word "meaning" with "reading," we reach almost the same conclusion. We still have one man who reads constantly but single-mindedly, one who shapes his own reading to the book-man standing before him, and one who refuses to read at all. The only difference between the innkeeper as a community and Quijano's family as a community is that he reads purely for his own entertainment, while the women shun the very act of reading within this context. The innkeeper's interactions with Don Quixote's complement the knight's hyper-informed reading, while the women treat their master's books as people. Both actions help free Don Quixote from his dependence on his books and exacerbate his condition as a dysfunctional reader.

Before turning to Don Quixote as a reader, I want to briefly mention that Cervantes also introduces another interpretive community, the one in which he himself engages with the reader in his prologue. He opens the work by addressing the reader directly as "desocupado lector," translated in most editions as "idle reader."⁸ By idle, Cervantes may

⁸ Cervantes was not the only author who used the prologue to speak directly to his audience. His contemporary, Lope de Vega, the most prolific of Spanish playwrights, wrote the prologue to his *Parte XI* (the third volume of a group of comedies) as though he "imagined his work not as a playtext to be performed, but as a text to be read in the quiet of one's own home" (De Armas 1100). This reader would

refer either to an idle body – meaning the reader in question sits and reads instead of engaging in more constructive pastimes – or to an idle mind – meaning he acknowledges the possibility that the reader will not properly read the text. This implies that he speaks to a certain social class whom he identifies as his readers, those who have the luxury to indulge in what he calls idle reading. However, by its very nature, reading is not an idle activity, therefore engaging in an interpretive community cannot be so either. Cervantes not only recognizes that reading communities exist, but he attempts to speak to the ones likely to analyze and rewrite his novel. He speaks directly to his “dear reader” with:

...I have no desire to go with the [current custom]⁹ or to implore you, dearest reader, almost with tears in my eyes, as others do, to pardon or excuse the defects you may perceive in this child of mine. You are neither its relative nor its friend, your soul is your own and your will as free as any man’s, you are in your own house and master of it...all of which exempts and frees you from every consideration and obligation. (9)

The words “current custom” indicate his awareness of Spain’s interpretive communities, which allows him to create his own within the narrative. He knows that different communities will employ different strategies, so he assures the reader that he accepts their analysis and subsequent reshaping of his text: “you can say what you will about the story without fear of being abused for any ill or rewarded for any good you may say of it”

turn to a random page and read a scene for “delight or insight, without necessarily taking into account the whole play” (1100), a very common literary convention.

⁹ While I use the Ormsby translation of *Don Quixote* throughout these pages, I have inserted here my own translation of the original phrase, “corriente del uso.” Ormsby translates it as “current of custom,” while Edith Grossman uses “common custom.” Though Ormsby’s translates literally – what is currently in vogue – the wording at first does not express that meaning clearly, whereas Grossman’s translation expresses a clear meaning but implies something standard rather than shifting trends. My translation meets in the middle.

(9). While the rest of the prologue begins the metatextual labyrinth that develops throughout the two volumes, Cervantes uses his two opening paragraphs to grant his blessing for the exchange of dialogue between multiple interpretive communities. The prologue then “encapsulates the literary issues that Cervantes both dramatizes and thematizes throughout the rest of the text, within the frame of his tale about the putative ‘history’ of Don Quixote and Sancho” (Presburg 215); the literary issue is an invitation to his reader to reshape his novel and his protagonist just as his other characters do upon encountering Don Quixote. In this way, he can juxtapose the functional readers (those who can move between various interpretive communities) with the dysfunctional ones (those who cannot operate outside of one community).

Interactions with Don Quixote’s Solitary Interpretive Community

These characters (and author) all demonstrate the interaction between interpretive communities, and even though they read/interpret each other as opposed to books, the contact still derives from the constant presence of books. How, then, does Don Quixote fail so spectacularly at reading for someone who does almost nothing else? It happens in part because his own interpretive community fails him. Quijano’s community (himself, the curate, and the barber) enables rather than deters his questions and extreme reading; when he decides to become a knight, he separates from that community. “...he hit upon the strangest notion that ever a madman in this world hit upon. He fancied it was right and requisite, no less for his own greater renown than in the service of his country, that he should make a knight-errant of himself, roaming the world over in full armor and on horseback in quest of adventures” (27). In that moment, he stops reading the books and he stops thinking, implying his transition to dysfunctional reader. Believing the stories to

be historical record, he allows his mind to stop pondering the plot holes, and blindly accepts the stories fact. In this case, it is not so much his reason that shrivels and dies, but his social competence which then facilitates his transition to dysfunctional reader. His literary competence fills to overwhelming capacity: he embodies the chivalric genre down to his fingertips and he becomes an expert on what it means to be a knight. Often when someone objects to him, he accuses them of not being either *cursado* or *versado* in chivalric responsibility— quite literally not possessing the book knowledge that he does. Through this hyper-informed reading, he forms his own distinct interpretive community, one that expects everything else to conform to it, and in so doing becomes the dysfunctional reader.

Cervantes's opening paragraphs indicate a competent reader while his protagonist still carries the name Alonso Quijano. While he does become too obsessed with the act of reading, neglecting his estate and abandoning his other favorite pursuits, such as hunting, he actively engages with the texts. He questions, he ponders, and he attempts to make some sort of logical sense of them. The logical sense eventually leads to his failure to read. The narrator says,

Over this sort of folderol the poor gentleman lost his wits, and he used to lie awake striving to understand it and worm out its meaning; though Aristotle himself could have made out or extracted nothing, had he come back to life for that special purpose. He was rather uneasy about the wounds which Don Belianis gave and received, because it seemed to him that, however skilled the surgeons who had cured him, he must have had his face and body covered all over with seams and scars. He commended,

however, the author's way of ending his book, with a promise to go on with that interminable adventure, and many a time he felt the urge to take up his pen and finish it just as its author had promised. He would no doubt have done so, and succeeded with it too, had he not been occupied with greater and more absorbing thoughts. (26)

Anachronistically, Cervantes's rhetoric mimics that of Fish's theory in that Quijano does realize that a reader must extract meaning from the text. However, his attempts to rationalize the books consistently fail, mostly because he continuously applies an incorrect interpretive strategy. To say that not even Aristotle would have extracted any meaning imposes Quijano's strategy on other readers; even though a text might not contain any meaning to generate, Quijano cannot reach that conclusion and seeks the meaning anyway, which in turn promotes the novel's reader to hope he finds it. In so doing, he demonstrates that he has already begun to lose his ability to read. He applies his knowledge of real world situations: he wonders about the battles taking place in the books, and he questions how the protagonist could still be so handsome after a fight, even though his body is no doubt covered in scars.¹⁰ He asks if the best physician possible had cured the knight, both of the injuries and of the scars. He puzzles over sentences such as, "the reason of the unreason with which my reason is afflicted so weakens my reason that

¹⁰ Murillo notes that one scholar counted 101 injuries that this particular protagonist, don Belianís, received in the two volumes of his tale, without any sort of enchanted armor or divine intervention to protect him. Once he begins his adventures, Don Quixote quickly acquires many of his own injuries and scars, also naturally lacking any sort of magical assistance for protection. While the most famous hero, Amadís, has an enchanter who protects him, don Belianís (Don Quixote's favorite) relies purely on his own strength. When Don Quixote tries to replicate this, he loses his battles (except for one victorious joust in Part II) and walks away disgraced. Even though the text does not include magical events, it seems he still waits for them to happen, which leads to a misreading both of the stories and his own adventures.

with reason I complain of your beauty” (26), and tries to extract meaning from an impossible tongue twister.

Here he begins to diverge from the community with his friends. He discusses the stories in general with the barber and the curate, but whether he debates these actual points Cervantes leaves up to the reader’s own analysis. More often than not, the characters debate which of their fictional heroes they should consider the best, whether that be Amadís as the most famous or his brother with a stronger spirit. If Maese Nicolás and Pero Pérez only discuss the qualities of the books’ lead characters, then either they have not thought of the same questions as their friend, or they have but do not consider said questions vital to their readings. Said questions become so vital to Quijano that he loses sleep over them and keeps reading to try and answer them. He only stops reading when he stops utilizing the rational part of his mind and fills his imagination with scenes from a book instead. In a sense, he subscribes to Fish’s understanding of the reading experience. He stops asking what the text actually says and begins to ask what it does, the basic tenet of Fish’s brand of reader-response criticism.¹¹ However, at this point the act of reading veers off course. The narrator continues,

In short, he became so absorbed in his books that he spent his nights from sunset to sunrise, and his days from dawn to dark, poring over them; and what with little sleep and much reading his brain shriveled up and he lost his wits. His imagination was stuffed with all he read in his books about

¹¹ Meaning develops in a dynamic relationship with the reader, so the reader’s assumptions and expectations become just as essential to his or her interpretation of a novel as their conclusions. Fish states “In practice, this resulted in the replacing of one question – what does this mean? – by another – what does this do? – with ‘do’ equivocating between a reference to the action of the text *on* a reader and the actions performed *by* a reader as he negotiates (and, in some sense, actualizes) the text” (2-3).

enchantments, quarrels, battles, challenges, wounds, wooings, loves, agonies, and all sorts of impossible nonsense. It became so firmly planted in his mind that the whole fabric of invention and fancy he read about was true, that to him no history in the world was better substantiated. (26-27)

Asking what the text does actualizes it and shapes the meaning the reader receives from it, but when Quijano begins actualizing it, his rational mind shuts down, he stops questioning at all, and he considers everything he has read up to this point as historical fact. By this point, he has stopped interacting with the texts themselves and only interacts with the books. He blindly follows the stories, reads as many books as he can acquire, and fills his mind with fantasy and enchantment without pausing to consider if any of it has a factual basis. Even worse, his two friends speak of the novels' protagonists as though they actually existed, which does nothing for Quijano's mental state. Maese Nicolás, the barber, describes his favorite fictional knight, don Galaor, as one with "...a spirit equal to every occasion, and was no wishy-washy knight or a crybaby like his brother, while in valor he was not a whit behind him" (26). They constantly discuss the characters as people, with the barber and curate unwittingly enabling Quijano to construct his own community. Only after Quijano saturates his mind with so many "history-stories"¹² and, to use Cervantes's own words, "impossible nonsense," does he get his idea.

His identity as Don Quixote comprises both the knight-errant and the (for the moment) solitary member of an extreme interpretive community. When he begins crafting the idea in his head to become a knight, he stops interacting with the texts; when he leaves home,

¹² A term of my own creation to describe Don Quixote's interpretation of the books.

he stops interacting with the books. Even though he returns home the very next day, he never sees his books again. His departure proves to himself and to the reader that his hyper-informed reading is complete and that he no longer needs the books. His encounters with other interpretive communities demonstrate his dysfunctionality as his hyper-informed reading conflicts with its surroundings.

Once he assumes his new identity and dons his armor, he leaves in the early hours of the morning on his first sally, and almost abandons the pursuit because he realizes he has not officially been dubbed a knight. He decides to remedy that technicality at the first place he finds, assuming that the first place will be either a castle or a shepherd's hut – it is neither. He arrives at an inn and endures the ridicule of two prostitutes lounging in the doorway; though he believes them to be proper ladies, he still hears their laughter. At first, they stare at him fearfully (they obviously do not often see a man carrying a lance) but when he speaks to them, they respond with laughter since they “were not used to hearing rhetoric of this sort” (33). Their laughter marks the first conflict between communities: they consider him ridiculous and he responds with an angry rebuke.

In order to interact with him, the innkeeper has no choice but to read him, if for no other reason than to prevent him causing trouble. Moreover, the innkeeper is the only resident who even attempts to read him, though the prostitutes soon catch on to the innkeeper's reading and fall in line. (They relieve the knight of his armor, feed him awkwardly through his helmet when they cannot remove it, and witness his knighting.) The innkeeper's advice also answers some of the questions that previously plagued Quijano, such as when he tells the knight that he should carry money and a clean shirt with him, small commonplace things “not recorded in the histories, because in the

author's opinion there was no need to mention anything so obvious and necessary as money and clean shirts" (35). For the same reason, he should carry medicine and ointment for injuries, just in case no enchanter is present. The innkeeper's *vulgo* community interacts with Don Quixote's solitary one in such a way that he does not contradict Don Quixote's interpretations, but he does not accept them either. He plays along with the knight's chivalric fantasy, but also instills common sense and a small dose of reality back into his hyper-informed guest, who decides he will return home upon being conferred his title to fetch the required items.

Once assured that the innkeeper will knight him the following morning, Don Quixote prepares to spend the evening in the inn's courtyard standing guard over his armor. However, he makes the mistake of setting the armor next to a water trough, so when a mule driver decides to fetch water for his animals, he carelessly moves the armor and invokes Don Quixote's anger. A fight erupts, Don Quixote hits both the first and a second mule driver over the head when they approach the trough, and other guests join the fight against him. Before the fight begins, the mule drivers ignore him (even though the innkeeper warned them of the mad guest) until they move his armor and he begins to fight. Powers describes the first muleteer as a "base creature" who "would have none of Don Quixote's nonsense; he does reject Don Quixote's reality. He is the positivist for whom there is no truth but material truth, and it is right and just that Don Quixote should smite him, for his is the mentality which will destroy Don Quixote; he is the most dangerous enemy of all" (295). However, he is not so much a positivist, as one whose interpretive community does not recognize Don Quixote's. It does not occur to the mule driver to engage in Don Quixote's dysfunctional reading, so instead he responds how an

ordinary person would. His actions against Don Quixote speak of a reader informed about his own place, and one with less chivalric familiarity. Since his community operates normally within the inn's setting and Don Quixote's does not, the man and his companions unsurprisingly win the ensuing fight. This does not deter the innkeeper from knightening Don Quixote – though he does it to get rid of him – and he uses the inn's ledger as a substitute for scripture to improvise a ceremony. The title of “knight” is the capstone to Don Quixote's community; once he has it, he completes his identity as hyper-informed and therefore dysfunctional reader.

Once knighted, Don Quixote very quickly asserts his identity as a knight-errant, contradicting one of his neighbors upon his return home after his short first sally. When the neighbor addresses him by his proper name, “Señor Quijana,” the only occasion someone does so in Part I¹³, Don Quixote asserts his identity loudly and clearly: “‘I know who I am,’ replied Don Quixote, ‘and I know that I may be not only those I have named, but all the twelve Peers of France and even all the Nine Worthies, since my achievements surpass all that they have done all together and each of them on his own account’” (46). That line serves as the cornerstone to the whole of Part I. Don Quixote knows who he is, his achievements surpass all those of the people he mentions, and nothing will deter him from his quest. He knows who he is, a knight. His loved ones know him as a dysfunctional reader.

¹³ According to the notes in Murillo's edition, this is the first and only time, at least in Part I, someone directly calls Don Quixote by his real name, if that even is his real name. While general scholarship as well as Part II's story all call him “Quijano,” this moment in Part I sees his neighbor address him as “Quijana.” This is one of many examples of Cervantes's word games with his readers, since in the first chapter the narrator tries to remember what the protagonist's name even is. During the events following his conversation with the neighbor, his two friends buy into his fantasy and call him Don Quixote, which helps him maintain his character instead of denounce it, while his niece only refers to him as “Uncle” or “Señor.”

His dysfunctionality affects him so deeply that his housekeeper and niece both do and do not recognize him when he returns home.¹⁴ They recognize his face and rush to embrace him, but stop when he asks them to fetch an enchanter to heal him. Don Quixote speaks to them, Alonso Quijano does not. When his community makes contact with the women's zealous one, they immediately blame the books for affecting him. As previously stated, we do not know how extensive their previous contact with books has been, but by their fear of fiction, we may surmise that most of the contact was confined to observing Quijano's decline. Either they cannot read the fictional written word or do not wish to, but both can read other people. Since the lines between communities often blur, we cannot know which persons read within our own community without reading and interpreting them just as we do written material. Because acts of interpretation include communication between people, even a spoken statement in a conversation requires interpreting by a second party. Thus our readings of humans reshape those humans just as they reshape a book's content. When the women see Don Quixote arrive home and hear his first words back, they rewrite their entire perception of him; he is no longer the master and uncle, but a knight-errant and a stranger. That clash between communities results in Chapter VI's book-burning episode.

The Inquisition, Literary Criticism, and Readers in the *Escrutinio*

Thus far, I have examined interpretive communities within Spain and *Don Quixote de la Mancha*, as well as discussed why Quijano's reading deviates so drastically from the rest of his community. However, what purpose does this serve within the overall

¹⁴ This parallels how Marcus treats Lavinia in *Titus Andronicus*, when he does not recognize her following her rape. Her rapists strip her of her identity and she only gains it back with reading; her father and uncle only truly recognize her again when she teaches them to read her.

narrative? Don Quixote builds his community around chivalric romance, but by 1605 reading material had lessened in quality due to increased readership. Printers catered to both a *discreto* audience and a *vulgo* one; Cruickshank defines the terms as those “capable of exercising judgment on the basis of literary criteria” (819) vs. those incapable of it. He also mentions Cervantes’s explicit fear of a *vulgo* readership (820). The print shops accepted books they knew would sell and circulated them with relative alacrity, so instead of a few definitive works in each genre, there appeared increasingly substandard reading material which followed the same conventions as said definitive works, but featured less than interesting protagonists and a lower quality of prose. Don Quixote’s dysfunctional reading includes both exemplary works and lackluster ones, so therefore we may say that his community does not so much create conflict as his hyper-informed reading of monotonous books does.

The first sally ends with the barber’s and curate’s plan to help Don Quixote reclaim his previous identity and enfold him back into their community. If he behaves as a dysfunctional reader, then presumably, the best way to restore functionality is to remove the stimulus, a.k.a. the paper books that spawned the new community. In Chapter VI, his friends and family agree that the best way to end his delusions and prevent another sally is to burn the offending books. They enter the hidalgo’s library¹⁵ and scrutinize each book (hence the Spanish term, *escrutinio*), which leads to a debate over whether or not said objects actually ought to be burned. Now, I return to my third principal question, how does the *escrutinio* function within the content of interpretive communities and how does it confirm Don Quixote’s community when its purpose is the exact opposite?

¹⁵ It is also worth mentioning that Cervantes never uses the word “*biblioteca*” to describe the library, but rather calls it an “*apuesto de los libros*,” or literally a room for books, which is exactly what it is.

Another of Fish's observations may answer the question for us. He explains, "It is only when readers become literary critics and the passing of judgment takes precedence over the reading experience that opinions begin to diverge. The act of interpretation is often so removed from the act of reading that the latter (in time the former) is hardly remembered" (5). Reading results in interpreting, that cannot be denied, but the reading experience shapes the text and extracts meaning. When the critic begins arguing in support of his meaning and rejects others, he refuses to engage in different types of reading. Don Quixote and his friends each interpret differently within the first six chapters. Don Quixote's own persona and his continued determination to mold everything else to his community demonstrates proof that he has forfeited the original act of reading. In the *escrutinio*, Maese Nicolás and Pero Pérez forfeit that act as well, which only enables their friend to remain insulated within his community rather than renounce it. Simultaneously, Cervantes critiques the chivalric genre that spawned his protagonist, and distinguishes between the exemplary and lackluster editions.

We may divide previous scholarship on the *escrutinio* into two factions: 1) those who interpret it as an inquisitorial parody or a general critique of censorship, such as Ryan Prendergast who explains the Inquisition's use of spectacle to maintain power;¹⁶ and 2) those who interpret it as an act of literary criticism, such as Stephen Gilman who

¹⁶ Scholars have previously commented on the ritualized style of the *escrutinio*, similar to inquisitorial procedure. Américo Castro understands the episode "as an exploration of the links between the written word and numerous lives of characters who are also readers" (quoted from Peña 940, my translation); he also examines why Cervantes would write a parody when the Inquisition was far from a joking matter. Peña combines the inquisitorial argument with the literary criticism one, stating that the barber and curate cannot distinguish between aesthetic texts and dogmatic ones, but argues more towards the inquisitorial camp since the episode also adds its voice to a debate regarding the value of books. Enrique Gacto Fernández chronicles the passages censored out of Cervantes's own works, and Ángel Romero treats the scene as an act of violence against books.

distinguishes between the types of books spared and the types burned.¹⁷ We may infer a third faction: those who interpret it as both, but why should Cervantes use such an extreme method of articulating his point? The answer is because both literary criticism and censorship allow him to comment on the parallel between reading and thinking. In the seventeenth century, “...los libros constituían entonces...el vehículo ideal para la difusión de actitudes doctrinales, corrientes de pensamiento e ideologías que pudieran ser consideradas peligrosas, cuando no abiertamente condenables, por los poderes constituidos” [...books constituted then...the ideal vehicle for the diffusion of doctrinal attitudes, thought processes and ideologies that could be considered dangerous, if not overtly condemnable, by the powers-that-be] (Fernández 11). Essentially, books led to people thinking. Ironically, the danger here comes not *from* thinking, but from *not* thinking.

The scene follows the practice of an impromptu *auto de fe*:¹⁸ the ritualized performance meant to instill fear in the prisoners and the witnesses, the procession of the prisoners into a public space, and finally, the sentences read and executed. It even occurs at the same time of day as a genuine *auto-de-fe*: in the morning immediately following Mass and breakfast. As previously stated, when the housekeeper sees all her master's books, she runs from the room, returns with a pitcher of holy water, and asks the priest to sprinkle it about the room for protection. She attempts to begin a Mass, hoping to cleanse the books, the house, and the household from the heresy she believes hides in the books,

¹⁷ In his *Vida de Don Quijote y Sancho*, Miguel de Unamuno wrote that the *escrutinio* was an act of literary criticism and was unimportant. Critics such as Gilman and Ludovic Osterc argue its importance because it functions as criticism: Gilman explains how the *escrutinio* helps Cervantes show his readers the problems with popular literature, while Osterc declares that true criticism was being ignored during the seventeenth century, then proceeds to examine each book mentioned in Don Quixote's collection.

¹⁸ The concept of an impromptu *auto-de-fe* is itself an oxymoron since preparations for one usually began a month in advance and only occurred when the Inquisition believed it had a sufficient number of prisoners.

but the priest only laughs in response. The priest and the barber treat each book as a person, the whole episode functioning as both trial and *auto-de-fe*. They force the library out of the private sphere and into the public, with the women acting as witnesses and executioners.¹⁹ Again following the ritualized practice, each book's identity is kept secret until the last possible moment, when one of the men reads its title out loud. They deliberate for a moment, then pass judgment on the book. They hand the guilty ones over to the niece, who throws them out the window into the courtyard to burn. The few they spare, the two men keep for themselves.

While this episode does reflect the theatrics involved in an *auto*, the ritual implies something different when compared with interpretive communities. Early Modern Spanish scholar, Ryan Prendergast explains the *auto* as:

...the Inquisition's vehicle to promote and enforce orthodoxy... These performances held subjects to prescribed parameters of belief and behavior by demonstrating the consequences of deviating from these norms. Through the recurrent disciplining of those who strayed from the imposed standards, the Inquisition engaged in the performance of spectacles meant both to create and display the regulatory power of the institution. The rituals were intended to act as a deterrent and to deploy a preventative pedagogy.²⁰ (11)

¹⁹ During an *auto*, the Inquisition passed judgment but did not see it executed. The prisoners were passed on to secular authorities who then executed the appropriate punishment. Each pair of people in Quijano's library falls into one of these positions. The curate and barber act as the Inquisitors and pronounce which books are innocent and which are guilty; then, they hand the books over to the housekeeper and niece, who act as the secular arm of the law and set the books aflame.

²⁰ Prendergast uses the word "performance" both to mean theatrics and as a method to enact social norms, similar to how Judith Butler uses it in *Bodies that Matter*. Performance, in this case, forces compliance, but can it also do the exact opposite?

While the Inquisition's parameters of belief revolved around Catholicism and the prevention of heretical thinking, what exactly does heresy imply in this episode? What if heresy simply means a failed point of contact between two divergent interpretive communities? Members within an interpretive community operate with a certain pre-established set of rules to guide their readings; as previously stated, a person may belong to more than one at a time, which allows for dialogue between groups. However, one community burning another's subject matter seems an extreme way for them to have a conversation. Maese Nicolás and Pero Pérez see their community crumbling around them or they observe the dysfunctionality in their friend. Building on the latter point, Powers suggests that "Cervantes was not so much interested in casting the books themselves into the fire as he was in pointing out the danger of vicarious existence through, or by means of, books. One whose life is lived in works of fiction loses contact with reality, mistakes barbers' basins for magic helmets and sheep for armies, confuses the real with the unreal" (291). Either way, they must remove the solo community their friend has constructed around his new identity.

They miss a vital point, however. Their miniature-Inquisition attempts to assert power over the texts, but they fail to consider that by the time he becomes Don Quixote, he has stopped interacting with the texts. Instead, they assert power over the physical books and destroy the bodies. It fails since the texts still exist within their friend's mind. Cervantes acknowledges this when he uses the word "inocentes" (quite literally, the innocent ones) to describe the books at the beginning of the scene: "...so eager were they both [housekeeper and niece] for the slaughter of these innocents..."²¹ (48). Regardless of the

²¹ Ludovic Osterc makes a similar declaration about the word "inocentes," claiming that "que no causaron la locura de don Quijote, o mejor dicho, que en el intento principal del novelista no hay tal locura en el

books' media, print or manuscript, the books themselves only act as messengers. Don Quixote reads blindly, he stops questioning, and eventually, the act of reading disassociates with that of interpreting, so much so that he cannot remember how to do either one. Hearing some of these stories read out loud would still have had the same effect. With the stories in his head, Don Quixote maintains his status as a dysfunctional reader, even though his collection is gone.

Cervantes returns to literary criticism again and again throughout the *Quixote*, and it derives “del amor a los buenos libros...en la crítica cervantina se salvan no pocos libros, incluso aquellos que condena, pues de ellos nos conserva al menos de nombre” [from the love of good books...in Cervantes's criticism, they save not a few books, even those he condemns, because he at least conserves for us their names] (Romera 3). If we consider the *escrutinio* as a particular form of literary criticism, what sorts of books does Cervantes argue for or against? The answer lies in the types of books that Alonso Quijano collects. Even though the narrator mentions early on the character's passion for chivalric novels, we see when the *escrutinio* begins that he possesses more than just that one genre. He also owns pastoral novels and at least two different types of poetry, lyrical and epic. For a man of relatively low status in the social hierarchy, Quijano possesses quite an impressive library,²² including each genre's definitive works and each's imitations and

hidalgo, sino una verdadera farsa en donde el protagonista, con sumo arte, representa el papel de loco” (61). Osterc claims that Cervantes wrote Don Quixote as a Hamlet-esque character playing out a farce under the guise of a madman, but does not explain why. Following the logic about interpretive communities, if the knight-errant persona really is a ruse, then Don Quixote could serve as a model for how not to read. Since so many people within the novel misread him, whether accidentally or deliberately, he does not fulfill his task.

²² Javier Irigoyen-García compares the number of books that scholars estimate Don Quixote possesses (ones mentioned in the *escrutinio* and not) and how much they would have cost. One thing all agree on is that the entire library “hubiera costado una fortuna” [they all would have cost a fortune] (Baker, quoted from Irigoyen-García 211).

sequels. The chart below contains a list of all the titles mentioned in the *escrutinio*, the genres to which they belong, and their fates during the pseudo-*auto de fe*.

Table 1: Don Quixote's Books in Order of Mention, their Genres, and their Fates

Title	Author	Date	Genre	Sentence
<i>Amadís de Gaula</i> , four volumes	Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo	1508	Chivalric	Spared
<i>Las sergas de Esplandián</i>	Rodríguez de Montalvo	1510	Chivalric	Burned
<i>Amadís de Grecia</i>	Feliciano de Silva	1530	Chivalric	Burned
<i>Don Olivante de Laura</i>	Antonio de Torquemada	1564	Chivalric	Burned
<i>Florismarte de Hircania</i>	Melchor Ortega	1556	Chivalric	Burned
<i>El Caballero Platir</i>	Unknown	1533	Chivalric	Burned
<i>El Caballero de la Cruz</i> , two parts	Part I: Alonso de Salazar; Part II: Pedro de Luxán	1521, 1526	Chivalric	Burned
<i>Espejo de caballerías</i> , translation from Italian	Boiardo	1533-50	Chivalric	Burned
<i>Palmerín de Oliva</i>	Unknown	1511	Chivalric	Burned
<i>Palmerín de Inglaterra</i>	Francisco de Moraes	1544	Chivalric	Spared
<i>Belianís de Grecia</i> , four volumes	Jerónimo Fernández	1545	Chivalric	Censored
<i>Tirante el Blanco</i> , translation from Catalan	Joanot Martorell	1490	Chivalric	Spared
<i>La Diana</i>	Jorge de Montemayor	c.1558	Pastoral	Censored
<i>La Diana segunda del Salmantino</i>	Alonso Pérez	1564	Pastoral	Burned
<i>Los diez libros de Fortuna de amor</i>	Antonio de Lofraso	1573	Pastoral	Spared
<i>El Pastor de Iberia</i>	Bernardo de la Vega	1591	Pastoral	Burned
<i>Ninfas de Henares</i>	Bernardo González de Bobadilla	1587	Pastoral	Burned
<i>Desengaños de celos</i>	Bartolomé López de Enciso	1586	Pastoral	Burned
<i>El Pastor de Fílida</i>	Luis Gálvez de Montalvo	1582	Pastoral	Spared
<i>Tesoro de varias poesías</i>	Pedro de Padilla	1580	Poetry	Censored
<i>El Cancionero</i>	López Maldonado	1586	Poetry	Spared
<i>La Galatea</i>	Miguel de Cervantes	1585	Pastoral	Spared
<i>La Araucana</i>	Alonso de Ercilla	1569	Epic	Spared
<i>La Austriada</i>	Juan Rufo	1584	Epic	Spared
<i>El Monserrato</i>	Cristóbal de Virués	1587	Epic	Spared
<i>Las lágrimas de Angélica</i>	Luis Barahona de Soto	1586	Chivalric sequel	Spared

More books reside within the library but Cervantes strips them of their identities with little more than a passing mention. By the time they reach *Las lágrimas de Angélica* (only spared because of its author's fame), the curate announces he is tired and all subsequent volumes, regardless of title or style, are added to the growing bonfire. If there were other salvation-worthy volumes within the collection, the outside reader never knows of them.

If we read the *escrutinio* as an act of literary criticism, we find that Cervantes warns against the type of interpretive community his protagonist creates, while simultaneously advising his readers on what constitutes good literature. As the curate and the barber inspect each book, they make an argument to either burn it or spare it, based on its plot, author, virtues, and faults. Of the twelve chivalric titles brought before their trial, only four of them escape the bonfire. The curate deigns that *Amadís de Gaula* should burn for being a dogmatizer of heresy, but the barber opposes him by stating that this book is “the best of all the books of this kind ever written...” (48); being the first and the most unique apparently is enough to buy salvation. *Palmerín de Inglaterra* they declare “a thing unique and let a casket be made for it...” (51), almost treating it like a relic deserving of its own reliquary, while they call *Tirante el Blanco* “a treasury of enjoyment and a mine of recreation...the best book in the world” (51-2). They do not exactly spare *Belianís de Grecia* as keep it for later censoring, invoking the *término ultramarino*, a way of giving people overseas time to arrive home.²³

²³ Again, we see the Maese Nicolás and Pero Pérez treating the books as living people, since the *término ultramarino* allowed anyone abroad who had been sued or indicted a period of time to return home and face trial. The books, however, cannot speak for or defend themselves, and this one's protagonist will not arrive to fight for its honor. Sparing this one from the fire allows Cervantes to subtly affirm its value as a novel (once any rubbish has been deleted from its pages) while also providing more clues as to the types of readers the curate and the barber are.

Similar arguments are made for any other exemplary volume in either poetry or pastoral romance, except with these, more books escape the flames than their chivalric counterparts. When the men finish with the chivalric novels, they almost leave the others alone after the curate announces that “These do not deserve to be burned like the others, for they neither do nor can do the mischief the books of chivalry have done, being intellectual books that can hurt no one” (52). He calls them “libros de entendimiento” or “books of learning,” ones that encourage thinking amongst their readers.²⁴ Only the niece’s continued admonitions that they might do future damage to her uncle persuade the men to include these books in the *auto* as well. The most famous work of pastoral literature, *La Diana*, escapes burning almost intact; the curate decides a few passages should be censored out, specifically ones concerning magic water and an enchanter. The process proceeds in the same manner as with the chivalric works, three pastoral novels survive – all described as “precious jewels” (53) or words to that effect – while the other four join the condemned. All three epic poems survive – likely because their stories extol the virtues of the Spanish Empire – and the rest of the poetry receives censoring. For the ones they spare, “el propio cura trasluce que está pensando más en el valor material del libro que en su valor literario” [the curate reveals that he is thinking more about the material value of the book rather than the literary value] (Irigoyen-Garcia 207).

Each spared volume possesses some exemplary quality that categorizes it as a work of good literature, while all the various imitations, sequels and spin-offs are consigned to the

²⁴ Many previous scholars, particularly Clemencín and Marín, have suggested revising *entendimiento* (learning) to *entretenimiento* (entertainment) (Cozad 160). Cozad notes that since “books of learning” usually referred to philosophical treatises, then Cervantes hints at his attitude toward the pastoral romance by calling them “*libros de entendimiento*, a phrase which for him signified at once books of intellect, meaning, and genuine poetry” (180).

flames. The reasons for burning vary; *Florismarte de Hircania* for its poor, stiff writing style, and *El Caballero de la Cruz* because they fear the devil may hide behind the cross. The reader watches as the barber and curate examine the books “salvándose los buenos y ardiendo los malos” [saving the good ones and burning the bad] (Osterc 60) or to use Gilman’s words, they “separate the sheep from the goats” (148). The various novels function as the seventeenth century’s variation of pop culture: specifically, these books imitate and recycle existing material without adding anything new to the discussion. Gilman notes how “the romance of chivalry was about as moribund as the western is today” (142), specifically because so many lackluster works circulated and consumers still bought them. The curate’s phrase “libros de entendimiento” gains new meaning when we examine the literary criticism argument from an interpretive-community standpoint. The pastoral romance consisted of a mixture of poetry, philosophy, and contemplation of nature, all things meant to provoke thinking while set in a fictional verse. Chivalric novels, on the other hand, contained magic, enchanters, battles, and damsels-in-distress, purely fictional creations that potentially could dumb down the literate populace and adversely affect their ability to reason. Even though he possesses the pastoral and the poetic masterpieces, we only see Quijano interact with the chivalric ones as he stops rationalizing and assumes dysfunctional-reader status. By extension, the books that promote thinking and entertainment also encourage debate between interpretive communities, and encourage those communities to employ their own strategies. The ones that burn allow for a “desocupado lector” to potentially read them incorrectly. Cervantes constructs his character around a genre that allows him to manipulate others into his reading and rejects any other interpretations.

Finally, while scrutinizing the books, Maese Nicolás and Pero Pérez fall victim to the same trap as their friend. They interpret the books they wish to save, but stop reading (both interpreting and physically reading) the ones they burn. They do not so much interact with the texts as with their memory of the texts' content. When they select each volume, they interact with the book, not the work. They do exactly what Fish warns against: they act as literary critics and pass judgment. They argue in support of their own textual readings and intentionally reject the community consisting of the housekeeper and the niece (just engaging in the *escrutinio* instead of burning everything signifies a clash between their two communities), but unintentionally reject their friend as well. They devote so much time to passing judgment that they forget their original purpose. By the time they finish, they have ceased interpreting the books and decide to stop reading entirely for at least the next chapter, demonstrated by throwing out anything after *Las lágrimas de Angélica* and by bricking up the library's entrance.

Don Quixote sleeps through the entire episode, blissfully unaware of the fate befalling his books. When he wakes, he immediately goes to his library, only to find the doorway and the books within gone. When he asks after it, the housekeeper answers “‘What room or what in the world is your worship looking for?’ she asked. ‘There are neither room nor books in this house now, for the devil himself has carried all away’” (55-56). When she answers the devil removed them, the niece – on the priest's orders – hurriedly corrects her by saying a magician did so, but that only enables him to maintain his community. Over the next two weeks, Don Quixote engages in more discussions with the barber and curate, in which they try to enfold him back into their community. The damage is already done though. Don Quixote immediately incorporates their invented magician into his

narrative and searches the village for a squire. During their conversations, he tries to convince his friends that the world needs a knight-errant while the priest “sometimes contradicted him and sometimes agreed with him, for if he had not observed this precaution he would have been unable to bring him to reason” (56). Every attempt to restore Don Quixote’s reason fails, because removing the physical books does not remove them from his head. Rather than curing him, destroying the books spurs him to get revenge on his arch nemesis, the enchanter, and instigates his second sally.

In conclusion, Don Quixote’s first sally shows the character forming his own interpretive community that cannot function within broader society. His interactions with the innkeeper and muleteer prove him the quintessential dysfunctional reader, and the conflicts between communities result in incidents such as the fight with the muleteers and ultimately in the *escrutinio*. With the *escrutinio*, Cervantes critiques the books that inspired his novel, distinguishes between good literature and pop culture, and warns his audience against Don Quixote’s hyper-informed reading. When the knight leaves again, he remains the dysfunctional reader, and spends the remainder of Part I educating others on the strategies of his solitary interpretive community. This occurs in stark opposition to Part II, when everyone around him educates him on their reading of Part I, an education which allows him to reclaim his identity as functional reader and reintegrate himself back into society.

CHAPTER TWO

DON QUIXOTE'S FUNCTIONAL EDUCATION AND THE PRINTING PRESS AS AN AGENT OF CHARACTER DESTABILIZATION

Cervantes published his sequel to *Don Quixote* in 1615, less than a year before his death. Even though ten years pass between the publications of both volumes, Part II's narrative opens one month after Part I's ends. And even though Don Quixote has spent that month at home, he has not yet shed his skin and reassumed his identity as Alonso Quijano. Within three chapters, a young *bachiller* (a university graduate) named Sansón Carrasco introduces Don Quixote to the recently published book chronicling his adventures. The "veracious history of my famous deeds" (30) that he hoped for now exists, but it does not aid him in asserting his chivalric identity. On the contrary, this book plants a seed of self-doubt in his mind and begins to deconstruct his interpretive community. His own book is not the only one he encounters. In 1614, a year before Cervantes finished his work, an unknown author who uses the pseudonym Alonso Fernández de Avellaneda published his own sequel. Among many other things, Avellaneda's text suffers from a lack of wit prevalent in Cervantes's text, misnames both Sancho's wife and the Moorish second author Cide Hamete Benengeli, and claims that Don Quixote no longer loves his lady Dulcinea. Between the printed Part I and the false sequel, Don Quixote fights to maintain his identity, but the interpretive communities he meets in Part II differ enormously from those in Part I.

In the previous chapter, I examined Don Quixote's lone interpretive community and how it categorized him as a dysfunctional reader in Part I. In this chapter, I argue that Don Quixote undergoes a process of education and evolution back to functional readership in Part II, caused by interpretive communities who impose their own interpretations onto him after reading his story, and by an encounter with a Barcelona printing press that confronts him with the fallacy around which he builds his identity. I will first define truth in regards to the *Quixote*, then explain the process behind the printed word in Early Modern Spain. I will then analyze how other communities in Part II react to Don Quixote after reading Part I. Finally, I will study how the visit to the print shop disrupts his and Sancho's interpretive community to the point that he can no longer sustain it.

According to Cory A. Reed, "Don Quixote, who lives in and through the books he reads, relies on their textual authority for his interpretation of the events that shape his daily life. For him, truth is determined by the printed word, and his selection of literary fiction as his primary reference creates the confusion of fantasy and reality that characterizes his madness" (66). Noted Cervantes scholar Edward Friedman makes a similar argument by stating that Don Quixote surrounds himself with an array of objects "that will validate both chivalry and his own chivalric identity" ("Books Errant" 43); in Part I, some of these objects include his own library, his choice of Dulcinea as his lady, Mambrino's helmet, and others. In Part II, the only object with which he associates is the printed book, whether that be his own story recently printed or Avellaneda's appropriation (Friedman 43). Books, as objects, build his interpretive community; we might also assume that the printing press indirectly builds it as well. Ironically, printing

also cures him of it. However, since the knight interacts with more types of texts than just printed books, Reed's statement raises two questions: is truth really determined by the printed word, and, more importantly, does print similarly shape truth for our protagonist? If we ask these questions within Fish's framework of interpretive communities and my concept of hyper-informed readers, we see how the printed book destabilizes Don Quixote's reading process of Part I. His literary competence changes because the discourse has changed. He no longer interacts with people who have read chivalric novels and who follow his pre-written script; now he encounters people who have read his story and write the script themselves.¹ They remove the pen from his hand just as Avellaneda removed it from Cervantes's hand by writing his own sequel.

These particular interpretive communities revolve around print culture. Previous scholarship on the print shop scene argue different stances on how printed matter affects Don Quixote's authority and agency. Roger Chartier describes in "The Press and Fonts: Don Quixote in the Print Shop," that Cervantes uses the print shop scene both to mock and plagiarize the very plagiarist who stole his character²; Isaías Lerner states how a type of "hipernarrador" (824), quite literally a hyper-narrator, "elimina la voz del autor, del traductor y, si se quiere, al transcriptor" [eliminates the voices of the author, the translator,

¹ Lerner makes a similar statement about the intertextuality between Parts I and II: "El lector del *Quijote* de 1605 contaba con la competencia que permitía identificar las ilusiones a los libros de caballerías; los de 1615 deben agregar el conocimiento de la Primera parte como texto autónomo" [The reader of the 1605 *Quijote* counts on the competence that lets them identify allusions to chivalric novels; those of the 1615 should add their knowledge of Part I as an autonomous text.] (819). Readers of Part II need both types of literary competence since Part II is a parody of a parody.

² Chartier references in *The Author's Hand and the Printer's Mind* the disquiet surrounding printers over potential typographical errors, something else Don Quixote quickly attacks when Sansón Carrasco shows him his printed story, and again when he learns of Avellaneda. For example, he derides the 1614 book for presumably calling Sancho's wife by the wrong name, Marí Gutiérrez, when she was called that along with at least three other names in Part I. Don Quixote's answer to that is "y no llama tal, sino Teresa Panza; y quien en esta parte tan principal yerra, bien se podrá temer que yerra en todas las demás de la historia" (487), 'when she is called nothing of the sort, but Teresa Panza; and when a man errs on such an important point as this, there is good reason to fear that he is in error on every other point in the history' (753).

and, if it wants, the transcriber] (824), then he names that hyper-narrator as anyone who has previously read Part I, so any reader inside or outside the narrative may override the author's voice. Throughout Part II, Don Quixote finds his own voice overridden by any (and just about every) character he meets, as all expect to see a mad knight-errant, thereby subordinating the man to the book. Friedman makes a similar argument that the printing of both Cervantes' Part I and Avellaneda's Part II led to:

...the "authentic", "legitimate" Part 2 subordinat[ing] all other objects, much more emphatically than in Part 1, to *the book*, understood in the narrowest and broadest sense. There is an allegorical edge to the 1605 *Quixote*, not just of the burning of books and souls but of the literary enterprise itself, through Cervantes, as an individual writer who evokes the act and art of writing, and Alonso Quijano, as an individual reader who evokes the act and craft of reading. (47)

By having his protagonist visit a print shop, Cervantes sets the stage for an exposé of the inner workings of book culture. Said inner workings include the printing process, a debate on whether or not the author can still claim authorship after publication, and how faithful the printed subject matter is to the manuscript from whence it came. By the end of the episode, Don Quixote is faced with the truth that all books are artefacts – manmade objects, and it is around these artefacts that he has constructed his community. Thus the press reinforces his education as functional reader begun by his encounter with the printed Part I.

What is the Truth?

What is true for Don Quixote? James A. Parr employs another of Fish's theories to explain that truth is:

...is not only relative, therefore; it is whatever one can be convinced of by those who are gifted at manipulating the spoken and written word. The person who succeeds in this brave new world of words is the one who can prevail through the force of his or her rhetoric. Facts are less important than feelings; overstatement trumps understatement; cool, calm, and collected are upstaged by fiery, frenetic, and flustered.³ (219)

In Chapter One, I remarked how Don Quixote absorbs the genre of chivalric fiction without pausing to consider whether or not the stories have a factual basis. It suffices that his literary competence believes the narratives to be true. He uses his interpretive community to manipulate the spoken word in such a way (after the *escrutinio*, he does not encounter another chivalric book) that he can persuade Sancho to join his community and he can face other communities' interpretations and still win. He may lose the battle (losing to a windmill or yielding to another interpretive community), but at the end of Part I, he still wins the war since his community is still intact.

Part II presents a different challenge. For the first time since Part I Chapter One, Don Quixote (not Alonso Quijano) comes into contact with the written word, this time with

³ Parr arrives at this definition of truth by citing another of Fish's works, the chapter titled "Rhetoric" from Frank Lentricchia's *Critical Terms for Literary Studies*. Fish claims that "the times in which it has fallen our lot to live are the age of a new form in the development of the species" (219, quoted from Parr), and uses the term *homo rhetoricus*. Throughout both volumes, we listen to Don Quixote's beautiful rhetoric and we note that it causes some characters to rethink their opinion of him. In Part I, Chapter 33 when he gives the arms vs. letters debate, he presents such a well-reasoned argument that no one can believe he is mad. He does the same again in Part II before Sancho leaves for his fictitious government (a very elaborate prank played by the duke), when he gives Sancho some advice on governing. His rhetoric works against him in Part II because it is not what the various communities want to hear.

his own story. At the outset, Sansón Carrasco presents him with a printed copy of Part I newly off the press, and informs him that print shops in Barcelona, Valencia, and Antwerp all circulate his work. Considering that Part II begins a month after its predecessor ends, it is more than impossible for one Spanish press to have completed the job, let alone a Belgian press. Don Quixote does not seem aware of the system in place for printing, but rather, he falls back on his customary excuse of blaming an enchanter for the book's existence. When Carrasco informs him that 12,000 copies have already been produced across Spain, Don Quixote responds, "One of the things that ought to give most pleasure to a virtuous and eminent man is to find himself in his lifetime in print and in type, familiar to the people and with a good name. I say with a good name, for if it is the opposite, then there is no death to be compared to it" (439). With that being said, he readies himself to read of his great deeds and shining reputation.

Within a few paragraphs, his attitude has already changed. He and Sancho skim through the book together, remarking on inconsistencies and incorrect statements, including the description of the windmill scene and the disappearance and reappearance of Sancho's donkey.⁴ Suddenly, the happiness that surrounds him when he hears his adventures circulate in print (regardless of whether an enchanter has worked his magic or not) disappears when he hears what others have said of his adventures. Cervantes writes

⁴ Much scholarly work has been done on the various editions of Don Quixote, specifically how each one attempts to correct continuity errors from the first edition. In Part I, an unnamed thief steals Sancho's donkey, and though he recovers it a few chapters later, he is also seen riding it at least once in between theft and recovery. When Part II Sancho reads this, he comments that either the writer or the printer was mistaken. O'Neill remarks "That Cervantes felt the need to address the issue ten years after the error had first appeared in print demonstrates how much it bothered him. However, if he thought that his authorial sleight of hand would spare him further embarrassment, he was mistaken" (12). Cervantes had already received much criticism and laughter from this particular continuity error, so much so that printers working on second editions and those with translations sought to correct it. Lope de Vega even mentions both the original mistake and Cervantes's correction in one of his plays. What remains is that not only could Cervantes address the change, so could the people printing his material.

his own self-criticism into his novel, leading Don Quixote to call the author “no sage, but some ignorant chatterer” (441). At one point, the conversation proceeds:

“For all that,” replied the bachelor, “some who have read the history say that they would have been glad if the author had left out some of the countless beatings that were inflicted on Señor Don Quixote in various encounters.”

“That’s where the truth of the history comes in,” said Sancho.

“At the same time, they might fairly have kept silent about them,” observed Don Quixote. “There is no need for record events which do not change or affect the truth of a history, if they tend to bring the hero of it into contempt.” (439)

Don Quixote and Sancho are quick to indicate which bits of the story they believe true and which false. That both Ormsby and Grossman translate the word *historia* as “history” rather than “story” adds another layer to the analysis. “Story” implies fiction, but from the beginning, Don Quixote concerns himself only with his perception of fact. His community considers his novels fact; on his first sally, he remarks on his goal of seeing “the veracious history of my famous deeds” (30) immortalized in chivalric history. Yet when he sees the book, he holds it in contempt specifically because it holds him in contempt, and he rebukes Sancho for highlighting a true statement that he would prefer erased. Confronted with this book, the seed of self-doubt plants itself in his head and for the first time, his literary competence gains awareness of other genres besides the chivalric.

From that point onward, he only interacts with the book and with communities that have read it. Truth for those communities is what they have read, not the person they see before them. Most prominent are the duke and duchess, with whom Don Quixote spends a lengthy visit. David Richter comments on how the duke's community uses cruelty as an interpretive strategy: "In contrast to the cruel acts seen in the first part, the cruelty of the ducal pair takes on an entirely new purpose and focus: providing pleasure to themselves as spectators. Rather than a cruelty based on disdain and disregard...the *duques*' cruelty appears to be based in sadism" (47). The pranks they play on him include dropping a cat onto his face while he sings, which prompts him to curse the enchanters present, and creating a fictitious government for Sancho. They use rhetoric generated from the written word to manipulate him, which at first, he should be able to counteract. However, he has not interacted with the written word since the beginning of Part I, and he interacted with a different type of written word. Truth for Don Quixote means his precious novels of chivalry, but the characters in Part II have read a parody of those works. His literary competence does not extend to parody, and for the first time, we see how he reacts to changing discourse. Because he does not read the whole of his own book – he reads some sections and listens to Carrasco's commentary – he finds himself unprepared to face Part II's communities. His education consists of a baptism-by-fire generated by new interpretive communities hyper-informed by their reading of him. Part II's communities prove dysfunctional since they cannot compromise with his, but they ironically aid in his return to functionality.

Printing both works to his advantage and, at the same time, backfires. He achieves his dream, to have people know of his adventures, however, they see not the noble knight-

errant he claims to be, but instead the madman and his bumbling squire. Blame lies with either the chronicler or the printer, but certainly not with him. Carrasco also remarks that defects in printed material are easier to spot than in manuscript, which supports the assumption that “printing carries with it its own risks. As in the episode of the stolen donkey, those who print books can make mistakes, ‘so you see, anyone publishing a book exposes himself to enormous risk,’” (Malfatti 98; the in quote citation comes from a separate translation of *Don Quixote*). Since truth via the printed word carried its own debate, truth for Don Quixote carries a different connotation than it would for Cervantes and his readership.

The printing press had been commonplace in Western Europe for approximately 160 years by the time both volumes were published, but that did not mean that all people and places had acclimated to it. Indeed, a certain stigma still held over the printed word, leading for readers to place greater authority on manuscripts. This distrust of printing derived from, “the many condemnations that provided a counterpoint to celebrations of Gutenberg’s invention by stigmatizing compositors’ mistakes, correctors’ ignorance, or the dishonesty of booksellers and printers, but, even more, the profound corruption of texts by readers incapable of understanding them” (Chartier, *Author’s Hand* 21). Don Quixote addresses each of these when he visits the print studio. True, given how many times a manuscript changed hands on the way to the press, errors in typography naturally occurred. If one were going to propound that argument, however, then one also has to consider the errors bound to occur after hours spent copying a text by hand. On the other hand, truth centered on meaning created tensions of its own. With how many times the manuscript changed hands, “decidedly, authors did not write their own books,” (Chartier

21), which led to “movement of meaning,” and who controlled what the text actually meant. Following Fish’s theories, the meaning depends on whoever reads the text, but Spanish authors expressed concern about their potential readerships.⁵ Interpretive communities base the truth around their readings, but how does this work when the debate questions the veracity of anything printed? In order to answer, let us examine the printing process itself.

The Printing Press in Spain

Before we proceed further, we need to understand the context of book production in sixteenth and seventeenth-century Spain, not to mention the process through which a book was published. Without knowledge of the process, we cannot hope to understand how the print shop episode alters Don Quixote’s self-perception and his concept of truth.

When Don Quixote enters the print shop, Cervantes immediately and concisely explains the basic process behind Spanish printing. The press itself rests against one wall, a man at one station sets type, another hangs freshly inked pages to dry, another corrects a printed page, etc. Printing historians Jaime Moll and John O’Neill give more comprehensive outlines of the process. Each printed book contained a series of what were known as *preliminares*, which usually consisted of six or seven items that granted the author and the printer their right to publish. These included:

...the *privilegio* or *licencia*, the *fe de erratas*, the *tasa*, and the *aprobación*. There might also be a prologue and a dedication to the

⁵ Chartier references Francisco de Quevedo’s *El sueño del infierno*, in which a bookseller condemns himself and all others of his profession because they put books in the hands of ignorant readers. While Quevedo refers to philosophical treatises, he nonetheless means the *vulgos* reading books previously exclusive to the elites. Cruickshank references Lope de Vega’s concerns in *Fuenteovejuna*, when a reader with discretion complains that printing presses both circulate rubbish and allow other authors to write under reputable authors’ names. The *vulgo* reading communities would not know the difference.

author's patron, as was the case with both of Cervantes's books. A *licencia* was simply a license to print the work, whereas the *privilegio* gave exclusive rights of publication to the author for a limited period – twenty years for the second part of the *Quijote* and ten years for *Ocho comedias*...The *fe de erratas* was not, as one might perhaps expect, a list of typographical errors, but an official testimony that the printed work was a faithful copy of the *original de imprenta*, a transcription of the author's manuscript prepared for the printer by a scribe, which had to be submitted to the censor for approval (the *aprobación*). The date of the *fe de erratas* therefore indicates when the printing of the body of the work was finished. (O'Neill 4-5)

Always the first to be acquired and the last to be printed in the book, the *preliminares* granted the author, at least, the opportunity to get their book onto the press and subsequently to vendors. However, even these had their difficulties. Production could not begin without the *licencia* or *privilegio*, yet there was no guarantee that the author would acquire either one. Both were granted by the *Consejo de Castilla*, or the ruling body which governed most domestic affairs and was second in power only to the monarch. Approving a text for the *licencia* was when the *Consejo* perused the book, searching for heresy and censoring out dangerous bits.⁶ The *licencia* was granted once the text was deemed safe, and only then could the *Consejo* turn to the *privilegio*.

⁶ The *Consejo* was a separate entity from the Inquisition; the former governed the land and set the laws, while the latter searched out heresy. Ryan Prendergast notes that the Inquisition generally handled books that were already printed and circulating, while the *Consejo* edited and censored the ones preparing to go to the press (n. 11).

The *privilegio* amounted to the seventeenth century's definition of copyright, and extended to all regions of Castile; to publish in Aragón, one needed a separate *privilegio*. This forced the author to consider just how expensive publishing could become. Unless they had a patron to cover the financial burden, the author had two options: 1) to pay for the printing out of pocket or 2) to sell the *privilegio*, thereby relinquishing all monetary rights to the text. Cervantes held *privilegios* for Part I in four different regions of Spain: Castile, Aragón, Valencia, and Catalonia, all of which he sold to a Madrid bookseller, Francisco de Robles (Moll 22).⁷ Robles, not a printer himself but a vendor, then had free license to publish the book according to his own wishes, including the choice of print shop to which to send the text. Anyone from the author, the translator (if it was in a second or third language), the printer, the patron, or a vendor could hold the *privilegio*, as long as they believed they held a reasonable chance of making a profit. The *privilegio* also guaranteed a certain security for the work, because once the book went to a certain printer, no others could agree to take the job.

Only after the *licencia* and *privilegio* were granted could work begin, and even then, there was another step before the book reached the press. From there, a scribe went to work and transcribed the entire manuscript into simply another manuscript. The word *original*, when used in the context of a print studio, referred not to the author's authentic copy, but to the scribe's manuscript from which the printers would work. The scribe would correct grammatical and spelling mistakes within the text and also act as censor,

⁷ Moll notes that as soon he completed the *privilegio* for Part I, Robles himself began soliciting one from the kingdom of Portugal, and two editions were published later that same year (22). Cervantes, apparently, had absolutely nothing to do with this second *privilegio* and therefore lost further control of his own story. This adds fodder to Don Quixote's argument that an author may gain notoriety for his work, but not money, since Robles reaped the rewards of not only Madrid's first edition of Part I, but also two editions in a neighboring kingdom.

omitting passages likely to cause offense even after representatives from the *Consejo* had already done so. From that point onward, one could make the argument that the book no longer belonged to its author; this complicates truth even further since the story has changed from the author's original intentions and might not convey the same meaning as the author intended.

After the scribe was finished, another group of censors would read through it and give either their approval or their suggestions of further omissions. Only then, when the *original* was complete, could printing begin. The printing process itself went exactly as one today would think of it: typeface and ink quite literally pressed upon a sheet of blank paper, usually either a folio or a quarto. The workers in the print shop also had to manipulate the manuscript to fit a printed page, using what Chartier calls *formes*, "that is, composing at one time all the pages to be printed on the same side of a print sheet. In the case of *Don Quixote*, for example, an in-quarto book in which each signature was made up of two printer's sheets, this meant that the first sheet would contain pages 1, 4, 13, and 16" (*Author's Hand* 151).

After the ink dried, another corrector would read the page and search for errors the typesetters made, then once those were corrected, the entire page would be printed again. The printer would make a test copy of the entire book, except for the prologue and preliminaries, then present it to the *Consejo* again for review and approval. A corrector would then ensure that the text aligned with the scribe's original, then the *Consejo* would grant the *tasa*, or the selling price. Once he had approval, the printer then had *carte blanche* to make as many copies of the book as he could pay for and as he thought could

turn a profit.⁸ He would reprint the book, this time with the preliminaries and the author's dedication to a patron (if applicable) in place, then the book would circulate among vendors. One print shop brought together workers skilled in typesetting, binding, engravings, illustrations, editing, different jobs most of which two centuries earlier had been done in separate guilds.

However long printing took depended on the size of the work in question and how many other commissions the printer had already undertaken. Juan de la Cuesta, the head of the print shop that completed both halves of the *Quixote*, took three months to complete Part I and seven for Part II, even though the former was significantly longer.⁹ Printing itself being a time-consuming task, why would there be more time spent granting the *licencia* and *privilegio*? On first glance, it seems this part of the process only took more unnecessary time since the text would be read and corrected by several people during the printing process. The answer comes from the Spanish crown, which helps bridge the gap between the printed word and truth. More than a century before *Don Quixote* gained popularity, the Catholic Monarchs recognized the value of printing as an agent of education, and established two print shops in Seville in the early 1490's. While other studios existed in Spain by this point (Barcelona and Valencia have the oldest printing history of the country), from an economic standpoint print production had not yet picked up steam. Ferdinand and Isabella's endorsement of printing saw the number of

⁸ It is estimated that Juan de la Cuesta's first print run of *Don Quixote* made between 1,500 and 1,750 copies, relatively standard for a Golden Age book (Chartier, *Author's Hand* 150).

⁹ The *privilegio* for Part I was granted on September 26th, 1604 and the *fe de erratas* on the first of December, which allowed the book to be on the shelves by early 1605. For Part II, the *privilegio* is dated on March 30th, 1615 and the *fe* does not appear until October 21st.

editions published in the 1490's double from that of the previous two decades.¹⁰

However, printing scholar F.J. Norton notes that in the first years of the sixteenth century, the authorities saw fit to impose legislation regulating the types of material printed.

In July 1502 a royal decree was issued from Toledo, addressed to all booksellers, bookbinders, printers, bookdealers, and their agents, in the realms of Castile and Leon, and enacting that, in view of the printing or importation of many books in many branches of knowledge, both in Latin and in Spanish, which contained defective texts, and of others which had vicious, reprobate or apocryphal texts, and of still others, newly written, whose matter was idle and superstitious, and in view of the harm and inconvenience that all these had caused, the book trade was forbidden henceforth to print any book in any branch of learning, great or small, in Latin or in Spanish, without first obtaining express licence from the Crown or from the person appointed by it for the purpose...All imported books had to be submitted for examination and approval by the same authorities. (119)

Said persons appointed for the purpose included the tribunals in Valladolid and Ciudad Real, and usually a bishop. In short, these tribunals acted as Inquisitors on behalf of the *Consejo*. Any author found in violation would see their books confiscated (and usually burned), would lose their investment if the book had already been printed and would pay a fine equal to that investment, and lose the right to any further printing (Norton 119). If

¹⁰ Norton notes that the number of recorded editions between 1472 and 1490 totaled less than 300; between 1490 and 1500, the amount increased to 600, then lessened back to 500 in the first decade of the sixteenth century.

the book in question was academic, then scholars would read and correct them as well, both before the *licencia* was granted and after the test copy was ready. The reasons for the *licencia*'s entire existence depended on print conveying some form of truth.

Authorities instituted these measures in an attempt to exclude both incorrect knowledge and heresy, and therefore any tracts legal, theological or medicinal in nature received the most intense scrutiny. In so far as fiction went, publishing rates, at first, did not seem to diminish.

As the sixteenth century progressed and the Spanish Empire began to decline, financial burdens took their toll on the publishing industry. Malfatti notes that even though the chivalric literature, which Don Quixote so idolizes, circulated widely in print, manuscript circulation increased due to economic crises as Spain slowly but steadily bankrupted itself (89). The class divide factors into this problem as manuscripts were written with a select audience in mind: those who could purchase them. Malfatti and José Manuel Lucía Megías both state clearly that certain literary strategies governed print production, strategies that revolved more around popular culture (see Chapter One). While people of all classes read printed books, manuscripts were not subjected to those strategies and therefore “reflect directly the intention and preferences of the authors” (Malfatti 89). Printing could be just as costly as circulating a manuscript, if not more so. Spain's rampant inflation during the latter half of the sixteenth century and the beginnings of the seventeenth meant that even prices at the bookstalls increased and the amount of money the author received decreased. Cervantes, himself, only received 1,336 *reales* for his first work of prose fiction, *La Galatea*, which did not get him very far because eighteen months later, he borrowed nearly 6,000 *reales* to pay off a debt (O'Neill

8). Twenty-one years later, he received only 1,500 for *Don Quixote* Part I. Both numbers represent the total sum of profits that Cervantes directly received from the profits of those books after selling their respective *privilegios*, with Robles receiving all profits once the books circulated. When we consider how fluid the book market could be, we see not only the necessity of the *privilegio*, but we also get an idea of how much money Cervantes lost in selling it. As long as the texts made money, the presses kept circulating them without much concern regarding the texts' veracity.

Cervantes's Interpretive Communities and Printing

Why should any of this make a difference in our analysis of Part II's interpretive communities? It does because Cervantes uses his knowledge of printing and the print shop episode to highlight how uninformed Don Quixote is of the printing process. By uninformed, I mean that quite literally he has no knowledge of it. Likewise, Part I's hyper-informed readers do not consider veracity nor the printing process when interpreting their reading material or the character they assume derives from the reading material. Don Quixote's dysfunctional community crumbles when confronted first with those hyper-informed readings, which in turn produce dysfunctional readings of him and Sancho, and second by the printing press, when he acknowledges that those dysfunctional readings will continue. Both situations evoke Powers's definition of education, that "ever-growing awareness of the complexity of reality [and] the ability to distinguish between reality and appearance" (288). Don Quixote's solitary community revolves around his perception of reality; printing in Part II directly shows him how dysfunctional that perception truly is. Neither Quijano nor Don Quixote grasp the fictionality of the

books; the press forces him to face it. How does printing factor into the novel's interpretive communities?

Printing almost never makes an appearance in Part I, probably because at the time, Cervantes did not concern himself with it. He never says outright what aesthetic types of books reside within Alonso Quijano's library, whether they be handwritten or printed,¹¹ and Don Quixote interacts with both as well as oral culture within the thousand-plus pages of his narrative. Nonetheless, Cervantes does make one reference to printing in another encounter between interpretive communities in Part I. When the priest and the barber stop at an inn while trying to lead their friend home, they argue that 1) none of the stories in chivalric novels reflect reality or historical events, and 2) just because it is written down does not make it fact. The innkeeper (distinct from the one who had knighted Don Quixote in the first sally) responds:

“It is a good joke for your worship to try and persuade me that everything these good books say is nonsense and lies when they are printed by the license of the Lords of the Royal Council, as if they were people who would allow a lot of lies to be printed, and so many battles and enchantments that they take away one's senses.” (248)

In a moment of delicious irony, the innkeeper reveals the entire strategy by which Alonso Quijano became Don Quixote. The curate immediately responds that novels are meant “to entertain our idle thoughts” (248), but in that moment, Quijano's original community interacts with one of the *vulgos*. While this innkeeper assures he will not

¹¹ Malfatti also notes that the knight's library is “almost unimaginable in the manuscript world” (96). Since most of his collection was published after the press came into vogue, we may further assume that Gutenberg's invention aids in his desire to become a knight-errant.

form his own community and become a knight either, he seems like someone whom Don Quixote could easily persuade to join his community based on the books' contents. He may follow a similar line of reasoning as Don Quixote when it comes to the veracity of a chivalric novel, but he possesses more awareness of the book trade than his own guest. Even this low-income innkeeper (and that he later asks one of his guests to read out loud a manuscript makes us question just how literate he actually is) knows how the printing process begins.

Certainly, Don Quixote remains unaware of the printing process in Part I's context, and why should he be aware? While Alonso Quijano interacts with the material books, Don Quixote interacts with the ideas conveyed by the books. Friedman also notes how "books cede to *the* book, to the publishing event that would seem to erase the dividing line between life and art" (52). For Don Quixote's interpretive community, life is indistinguishable from art and both, in the form of books, convey truth. Whether the book is manuscript or print seems not to cross his mind. Suddenly at the beginning of Part II, print directly challenges him; from then on, it never leaves his mind because he realizes that his reputation precedes him. By the time he reaches a destination in his third sally, the people he meets know his name and base their expectations on their readings. While the duke and duchess are certainly Part II's most prominent readers, Don Quixote's thirty-chapter stay in their court warrants a study of its own.¹² For this purpose, I will examine two other communities, ones that address his time in Barcelona.

¹² Previous scholarship on the duke and duchess elucidate their effect on Don Quixote's self-perception. Thomas R. Hart calls them the chief villains in a novel whose comedic scenes contain tragic undertones (372); David F. Richter comments how Part II's Don Quixote "participate[s] in a lived experience" (44) with the ducal court acting as focal point to cruel theatre and game-playing that aid in Don Quixote's breakdown (44). In "Reading Redressed," Edward Friedman calls the duke and duchess "merely spectators in search of a spectacle" who drain Don Quixote of his energy before he reaches Barcelona (46). None of

While en route to Zaragoza (Part II Chapter 59), Don Quixote and Sancho stop for the evening at an inn, where they hear two other dinner guests discussing Avellaneda's sequel, the first time it is mentioned in Cervantes's work. The men debate whether or not to read more of it, one of them calls the sequel "absurd stuff" (752) and the other replies "Nevertheless, we may as well read it, for there is no book so bad that there is not something good in it" (753). When Don Quixote confronts them about reading something so completely and utterly untrue, the men claim first that they take no pleasure in reading this particular sequel, as does no one who read and enjoyed Part I. When he identifies himself, they recognize him as being the real Don Quixote and immediately begin to read him like they read the book. However, they read him in the context of Avellaneda's work, not Cervantes's. When Don Quixote recounts his adventures from Part I, the travelers seem to forget their familiarity with the Don Quixote of Part I, even though they obviously have read the book.

The amusement the two gentlemen derived from hearing Don Quixote recount the strange incidents of his history was exceedingly great; and if they were amazed by his absurdities, they were equally amazed by the elegant style in which he delivered them. On the one hand they regarded him as a sensible man, and on the other hand he seemed to them a madman, and they could not make up their minds where between wisdom and folly they ought to place him. (754)

Sensible, mad, elegant, eloquent, wise, how does one begin to classify this man? While speaking, Don Quixote's community protects him, but these men – named Don Juan and

these scholars address the ducal court as another extreme interpretive community driven by a hyper-informed reading, a reading I intend to develop at a later date.

Don Jerónimo – belong to a community with previous knowledge of him. In this moment, to use Friedman’s phrase, he takes a backseat to both the character of Part I and Avellaneda’s character and is now “the object of the metafiction of readers within the text” (“Books Errant” 44). Since Don Quixote expresses moments of lucidity in Part I as well and gives speeches just as eloquent, these men seem to forget that other characters in Part I responded with similar confusion as to his supposed madness. Don Juan and Don Jerónimo’s interpretive community demonstrate a hyper-informed reading of Avellaneda, who, lacking Cervantes’s wit, wrote a character without eloquence. Their community dysfunctions and clashes with Don Quixote’s, but from this conflict he still emerges the victor since only he can claim authority over his identity and his community. It is a small victory, particularly since he is still drained from the ducal cruelty, but a victory nonetheless. However, his literary competence has extended to include his apocryphal sequel. Printing not only gives the real protagonist his sense of self, it has also given birth to an imposter. The travelers mention that they met a man claiming to be Don Quixote travelling to Zaragoza to compete in a jousting tournament. Rather than face his imposter directly, Don Quixote decides to avoid him by any means possible, thereby retaining his own book-absorbed, dysfunctional readership and not risk mixing it with inferior work. In other words, he wishes to maintain his discretion and avoid a *vulgo* text. Thus, he changes his destination to Barcelona, and meets another pranking community, this one on a lesser scale of cruelty than the duke.

His host in Barcelona, Don Antonio, interprets him in much the same way the duke does; he reads him as the knight from Part I, and thus plans a few harmless pranks, “for jests that give pain are not jests, and no amusement is worth anything if it hurts another”

(768). This depends on what constitutes getting hurt. Don Antonio's pranks do nothing to harm Don Quixote and Sancho physically – unlike the duke, whose pranks hurt physically and mentally – but he does play tricks that force knight and squire to question their interpretive strategies. One such is a talking brass head that acts as a fortuneteller (a man listens from the next room and speaks into a tube built inside the head so it appears the head speaks). Don Quixote asks if an earlier adventure in Part II was real or a dream, and the head answers ““there is something of both in it”” (773). By now, Don Quixote's interpretive community stands on shaky ground. Whereas in Part I he remained assertive of his worldview (the windmills are giants, after all), in Part II he can no longer distinguish between his reality and the reality of those around him. Don Antonio's jests demonstrate an informed reading of Part I, but one also functional enough that he can incorporate those jests into society around him without doing physical harm to Don Quixote. Cordua comments that “Las farsas de los burlones crean la apariencia grotesca de que los antiguos planes de vida de don Quijote ya lo han acabado de llevar a la meta que él se propuso al dedicarse a su vocación” [The mockery of the mockers creates the grotesque appearance that Don Quixote's previous life plans have already brought him to the goal he proposed when he dedicated himself to his vocation] (99). Except, he has not achieved that goal in quite the way he expected. Instead of being praised as a knight, he is constantly ridiculed, and his notoriety derives directly from the printed word and the interpretive communities that have engaged with that word. Encounters with these communities begin Don Quixote's education as Powers understands it, and afford him a growing awareness of the reality that exists beyond his dysfunctional reading, a reality where knights-errant do not exist.

Don Quixote in the Print Shop

I want to end this chapter with an examination of the print shop episode and how witnessing the press in action shatters what little confidence Don Quixote still has in his interpretive community. Once he realizes that his interpretive strategies revolve around books as artefacts, he completes his education back to functional readership.

His conversations with Carrasco, Don Juan, and Don Jerónimo hint at his attitude towards print; one book narrating his adventures does not live up to his standard, the other is categorically wrong. By the time he arrives in Barcelona, his attitude towards printing has not improved. Even so, he cannot help his interest when he and Don Antonio take a walk through Barcelona, and he sees a sign over a door that reads “Books printed here” (775). Never having visited a print studio before, curiosity gets the better of him and he goes inside, and curiosity nearly kills the proverbial cat. He walks calmly through the workshop, moves from one station to the next, and observes each apprentice diligently at his work:

He entered with all of his following and saw them printing pages in one place, correcting in another, setting up type here, revising there;¹³ in short, all the work that is to be seen in great printing firms. He went up to one case and asked what they were doing there; the workmen told him, he

¹³In the Spanish text, the verbs *corregir* and *enmendar* translate into the words above “correct” and “revise” respectively. Even though both mean “to revise,” the two words demonstrate different parts of the process: *corregir* shows the men quite literally correcting the *original* and fixing grammatical mistakes, and *enmendar* means the correctors who go over the printed page. The first words of Covarrubias’ definition of *enmendar* are “corregir el hierro” or literally, “correct the iron.”

watched them with wonder, and passed on. He approached a man at another set of cases and asked him what he was doing. (775)

For Don Quixote, this entire experience must be something akin to watching his own birth. Previously unaware of the printing process, he sees multiple books compiled piece by piece. While printers could and did make mistakes, he also observes firsthand at least two different sets of readers carefully revising their respective texts. The enchanter from his conversation with Carrasco never arrives. He peruses the shop in curiosity and wonder, but at first, we are not sure at what specific item his wonder is directed. Is he fascinated by the press itself? Does he speak to the correctors at work? Cervantes only tells us that Don Quixote walks over to a display case, asks the people by it what they do, and they apprise him of their role within the shop. Possibly, he directs his awe at the press itself, the surrogate mother that birthed many of the books in his library and that allowed his story to reach eyes and reading minds throughout Spain. His interpretive community consists of himself and Sancho and it derives from books; inquiring after the process behind them seems rather counterproductive to a man believing himself to be a knight-errant. However, Cervantes does have a purpose: he dismantles the printing process, explains to his readers the method that produces their art, and simultaneously awakens Don Quixote to a world of technological advancement in which enchanter have no place. Don Quixote also observes a fallacy behind the books: the printed book does not reflect the original manuscript, and therefore does not reflect its author's intentions. The scene renders void the works around which he constructs his literary persona, and the truth they once conveyed evaporates. His interpretive community finally sees the artifice

behind the novels, so the press acts as a *desengaño* or “disenchantment” that completes his education and transition back to a functional reader.

This education finishes with two specific instances in the print shop, the first being a conversation between Don Quixote and an author overseeing the printing of his book, and the second being his direct confrontation with the press. As to the first, Don Quixote addresses one of the apprentices typesetting and inquires after his project; the man replies that he is compiling a page of an Italian novel translated into Castilian, then indicates the translator standing nearby. Cervantes does a curious thing here. Don Quixote engages the translator in conversation and asks some of the particulars in translating between a Tuscan dialect and Castilian, a relatively natural and (for Don Quixote’s interpretive community) safe topic of conversation. By engaging the translator, he can broaden his knowledge of printing while entering into a topic that does not endanger his hyper-informed reading of fiction. However, instead of using the word *traductor* to describe the second man, Cervantes uses the word *autor*, as though he initially put the novel to pen and not the Italian author. This begs the question: what constituted an author in 1615? While the word *traducción* did form part of popular speech in the early seventeenth century, the word denoting the actual person, *traductor* did not. Covarrubias only mentions that the “traducción es la mesma obra y el tradutor el autor della.”¹⁴ The translation is synonymous with the original work and the translator becomes the author of said book. The author loses the security he feels at knowing the work belongs to him, his imagination, his pen, a feeling Cervantes would have experienced every time someone

¹⁴ It is worth mentioning as well that Covarrubias does not include a separate entry for the word *traductor* in the *Tesoro*. He includes it under the definition of *traducción*, a move that seemingly downplays the relevance of the actual person.

translated one of his works and certainly experienced when Avellaneda stole his name and character. Don Quixote then makes a long, very telling statement on both translations and printing:

“I would venture to swear,” said Don Quixote, “that your worship is not known in the world, which always begrudges rewarding brilliant minds and praiseworthy labors. What talents lie wasted there! What minds shoved into corners! What real virtues rejected! Still it seems to me that translation from one language into another, except from the queens of languages, Greek and Latin, is like looking at Flemish tapestries on the wrong side; for though the figures are visible, they are full of threads that make them indistinct, and they do not show with the smoothness and texture of the right side...” (776)

Don Quixote makes several interesting claims with this monologue, not the least of which is that the world does not reward those ingenious minds who attempt commendable works. By saying that very little reward comes to certain men, Cervantes reflects on his own prestige as a writer, which he did not receive until Don Quixote became a bestseller. It hearkens back to the argument he made in Part I in defense of arms as a career, ultimately concluding that a career as a soldier befits a man’s honor more than one as an academic. Since a few years earlier, King Felipe II’s court had been “sharply criticized for being ignorant and unlettered” (Kamen 197), a statement asserting that the world did not appreciate ingenious minds does not seem out of place.

His next remarks center on the overall task of translation. Cervantes’s books demonstrate his own command of the Spanish language, but he warns that translations

would not demonstrate likewise. He appreciates the humanists' approach to learning, translating texts from "the queens of language," Greek and Latin, but considers translating between other languages as almost a waste of time. If the book in the original language is a work of art, the translation dismantles the artifice in its own way. A book undergoes so many revisions before it reaches the booksellers, even when it does not also undergo a translation. When working with a translation, one also has to remember an Early Modern tendency to mimic tone, while not necessarily adhering to the book's lexical choices:

Early modern translators would freely add to the original text, distort it, or omit sections from it according to their own whims and their perception of their readers' desires or expectations. What may seem irreverence from the perspective of the modern day was the result of an attitude to translation that saw the practice as akin to imitation or emulation.

(Thacker 34)¹⁵

If an apprentice in the print studio could either make a change or commit a simple error, how many revisions had Don Quixote's story undergone while in translation? When Cervantes completed his genuine continuation in 1615, Part I had circulated throughout Spain, and had certainly reached Portugal, England, Antwerp, and Milan. Avellaneda's apocryphal work birthed a second Don Quixote existing and roaming about Spain; now,

¹⁵ Twentieth-century translation theories argue either in favor of domestication, which brings the source text closer to its target audience, or foreignization, which brings the audience closer to the original source culture. Most can agree that a decent translation maintains accuracy in both the register and tone of the work, as well as the overall story and lexicon. Early modern translators, on the other hand, only concerned themselves with mimicking Cervantes's wit, even if that meant sacrificing other particulars of his writing style. Thomas Shelton's 1612 translation, the first published in England, attempts to maintain Spanish word order and lexical equivalents wherever possible, but still occasionally falls victim to careless mistakes, such as "to mend" for *enmendar* (Thacker 35).

printing had spread his work across Europe, which might reasonably lead him to think of others masquerading as him in other countries. His hyper-informed reading of chivalric romance yields to a more discreet understanding not only of book production but of how Part II's interpretive communities so easily defeat him with their own hyper-informed reading of him.

In any case, the conclusion to his speech gives us another glimpse of Cervantes's own opinion of printing, that translating takes as little command of language as transcribing a page onto another page. Either Don Quixote knew more about the printing process than he previously articulated, or those first minutes in the print shop quickly taught him the steps. He references the scribe making the original that will eventually be printed, stating that his job only requires the ability to write rather than the ability to think and express ingenuity. The book ceases to be an ingenious work as soon as the *Consejo* grants the *licencia* and *privilegio*. Once the scribe obtains the book, it becomes a material object waiting for the next reader to consume it. Likewise Don Quixote awaits the next person either to recognize him for the knight he considers himself to be, or to consume him as a materialized body that the press perhaps ought not to have materialized. Part II's interpretive communities consume him in such a way by reading him the way they read Part I.

Returning to the conversation, Don Quixote then asks the translator if he paid for the printing out of pocket or if he sold the *privilegio* to a bookseller. The man replies that not only did he cover all expenses himself, but he hopes to sell the books for six *reales* apiece. Don Quixote responds “It is plain you do not know the ins and outs of the printers and the collusion among them. I promise you when you find yourself saddled

with two thousand copies you will feel so sore that it will astonish you, particularly if the book is a little out of the common and not in any way spicy” (776). This tells us three things: first, this author/translator is comfortably wealthy enough that he can pay for his own work without depending on a patron or selling the *privilegio*; second, he is confident that the book will sell all 2,000 copies and he will get the selling price he wants; and third, Cervantes gives us a little more insight into the world of printing. Don Quixote warns his companion that if the book does not sell – he explicitly says if it contains no juicy material that will boost sales – then the translator will have two thousand books on his hands, and no money in his pockets. He also warns that the print shops and booksellers would alter their accounting books to make more copies, keeping most of the profits for themselves while only paying him a small percentage of what he is owed. Cervantes expresses his reservations about printing, but nonetheless recognizes it as the only means of sharing his work with a discreet audience.¹⁶ The translator reflects on this insight when he claims that he only prints this particular book for profit, and that he has already garnered fame for previous works. Don Quixote’s wishes him good luck and reminds him that a printed work can bring him either money or fame, but not both. Such was the case with Cervantes, whose works brought him fame throughout Spain and most of Western Europe, but almost no money. Even though he was a widely recognized name, when it came time to publish the *Novelas ejemplares* in 1613, he sold the *privilegio* for 1,600 *reales*, only 100 more than what he received for *Don Quixote* Part I.¹⁷

¹⁶ O’Neill discusses the sharp increase in Cervantes’ literary output in the four years before his death, arguing that whatever reservations he might have had about printing, he knew it was the quickest way to get his work to a literate audience.

¹⁷ O’Neill notes that the 1,500 *reales* for Part I was likely a worse deal than the 1,336 for *La Galatea*, due to Spain’s declining economy and increasing inflation. We may surmise that even though the *Novelas ejemplares* arrived on the presses only eight years later, the price he received for that text was a worse deal yet.

Cervantes states that by choosing to print a book, an author must decide which he considers more valuable, reputation or money. We cannot say, for certain, which he might have preferred; what we can say is that the printed word gave both him and his character much fame and notoriety.

The above conversation reflects Don Quixote's growth back into functional readership. He demonstrates enough knowledge of the printing process to indicate his ability to function within Spanish society, and the advice he passes on to the translator shows a remarkably lucid man instead of one the rest of the world presumes mad. By now, Don Quixote has nearly reached his ability to distinguish between reality and appearance, as Powers articulates. One other educational moment occurs in the print shop, when he confronts the press itself.

After leaving the translator to his work, he sees two books currently on the presses. The first is a religious work titled *Light of the Soul*, about which he says, "Books like this, though there are many of the kind, are the ones that deserve to be printed, for there are many sinners in these days, and innumerable lights are needed for all that are in darkness" (777). The work's title likely derives from "a generic reference to the type of religious work that dominated Spanish publishing at the beginning of the seventeenth century, or else an allusion to a work that was one of the bestsellers of the time" (Chartier, "Press and Fonts" 37). This demonstrates two things: first, it complements the *escrutinio*'s variety of literary criticism, explaining which books do and do not deserve to be printed; and second, it validates Don Quixote's growing awareness of different literary genres and his renewed literary competence. Within the print shop, his education shows

him the fallacy behind artifice and what sorts of texts his solitary community excludes. However, that education climaxes when he observes the second book on the press: Avellaneda's false continuation. This leads to a jarring, and likely traumatic, moment when he realizes that the presses will print anything whether a "veracious history" or alternative facts. Between Avellaneda's presence in the shop and Don Quixote's response to it, we see a mini-drama unfolding. Don Quixote loses all agency within his own narrative, just as Cervantes temporarily lost authorial control over his work when Avellaneda published his apocryphal work. Behind the artifice of the book, Don Quixote sees the artifice of himself. As he explores the shop, so do the readers go behind the scenes, so to speak, and learn the reality behind the artifice. When faced with the printing press, Don Quixote engages in a moment of self-education; he sees the creation of the books that gave him his own chivalric identity, and the machine that birthed his own story, thereby showing him the truth about himself. In that moment, he sees the dysfunctionality behind his previous readings.

He only reacts by remarking that Avellaneda's book should be burned (we should remember what happened to his own library) and angrily walks out of the building. However, the damage is already done, and this time an enchanter cannot explain away what he sees. Don Quixote's interpretive community rests so heavily on books that anything that disturbs his carefully constructed character does considerable damage. Part II's interpretive communities damage him by continuously interpreting him along their hyper-informed readings of Part I, which begin his education; the press damages him by destabilizing his perception of reality, thereby disillusioning him. His delusion centers on the books acting as historical record; the press unveils them for what they are, artefacts

that quickly diffuse into the reading populace. His literary competence has shifted so much that he not only has internalized the chivalric genre, but also the process that made it. He is informed whether he wants to be or not, both of printing and of his own previous hyper-informed readings. He leaves the shop and does not look back, but his encounter with the press has shattered his self-image and forced him to acknowledge that he has constructed interpretive community around manmade artefacts. His interpretive community has cracked so badly that a few chapters later when he jousts against the Knight of the White Moon (Sansón Carrasco in disguise), his defeat comes swiftly and easily, and he agrees to return home. Once home, he expresses his loathing for chivalric novels, ““odious to me now are all the profane stories of knight-errantry; now I perceive my folly”” (826), reassumes his identity as Alonso Quijano, and writes his will. He also asks Sancho to forgive him for inducting the squire into his interpretive community. With that community now gone, he dies as country hidalgo, Alonso Quijano, functional reader and education complete. The printing press created Don Quixote and by the end of the book, it destroyed him.

In conclusion, Don Quixote’s education stems from interactions with Part II’s various interpretive communities, many of whom present themselves as hyper-informed readers of Part I, and from his confrontation with the printing press. Altogether, both experiences expose his own hyper-informed reading of romances of chivalry and stimulate his growth back to a functional reader, Alonso Quijano, who devotes his last days to pleading forgiveness for his actions as a knight-errant. Thus far, this dissertation has examined interpretive communities and dysfunctional readers within Don Quixote. Now, I turn to England and how Shakespeare uses the same concept of (dys)functional readers to shape

Prospero's character in *The Tempest*. If we engage in a Cervantine reading of Shakespeare, we begin by searching for the same sorts of books that so prominently inspire hyper-informed readings in *Don Quixote*. Prospero begins, in a sense, as a quixotic character since he also sequesters himself with his books and is hyper-informed by their contents; similar to Don Quixote, he also builds a solitary interpretive community around them. The next two chapters will examine that community and his education back to functional readership.

CHAPTER THREE

PROSPERO'S INTERPRETIVE COMMUNITY, DYSFUNCTIONAL READINGS OF
MILAN AND THE ISLAND, AND BEGINNING EDUCATION

The first half of this dissertation examines first Don Quixote's identity as hyper-informed and eventually dysfunctional reader, then his education back to functional reader with the printing press catalyzing that education. In the next two chapters, I intend to examine the same process of dysfunctional to functional readership in William Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, specifically how his own interpretive community conflicts with other such communities both in Milan and on the island. Rather than a comparison of how Cervantes and Shakespeare themselves respond to interpretive communities, this dissertation compares specifically how Don Quixote and Prospero respond to those communities, and what stimulants reignite their education and reincorporate them back into their respective societies. "Ambos personajes son afectados por el proceso de leer y sus realidades están constituidas por la ficción que los libros han alimentado. Esa existencia ficcional, que para ellos es la única posible, es reconocida por los propios protagonistas, que se saben no solo sujetos lectores, sino además objetos de lectura" [Both characters are affected by the reading process and their realities consist of the fiction with which books have nourished them. This fictional existence, the only possible one for them, is recognized by the same protagonists, who know themselves as not only readers but also reading objects] (Longres 109, my translation).

Longres compares how Don Quixote and Prospero share a similar consciousness regarding their respective identities: for one thing, their very existence depends on the creative process and that “they are objects for a reader’s enjoyment” (111, translated), and for another thing, both of them become someone or something else out of devotion to books. They become a type of other;¹ in this case, they “other” themselves into becoming characters outside of society that live within their own self-contained book realms. Both men absorb themselves in their books (albeit different types of books) and both forget themselves (their social statuses and their identities) to the point that the books form the core of their identities. Prospero undergoes much of the same transformation as his Spanish counterpart: he occupies a higher place in society than Don Quixote does, and like the hidalgo, he neglects his duties in order to spend more time reading. While we never get an idea of how many books he possessed in Milan, we may assume that between his thirst for knowledge and his position as a duke, he (like Alonso Quijano) retained quite an impressive library.² This time, however, he does not lie awake at night searching for answers to impossible questions. Rather, he dedicates himself to the “bettering of my mind” (I.2.90) in study of the seven liberal arts, “o’er-prized all popular

¹ While Longres does use the word “other,” the adjective she chooses to modify it, “enajenado,” (107) proves more interesting. “Enajenado” translates to “alienated,” “enraptured,” and in some contexts, either “mad or unhinged.” While she does not state it explicitly, she certainly suggests the connection that both men are “othered” because of a type of *locura*, also reminding the reader that the words *locura* and *lectura*, madness and reading respectively, “en español se encuentran cercanas” (107) or “they keep close to each other.” How may we define “madness” with regards to Prospero, especially since his particular type of madness would not and does not reach nearly the extent that Don Quixote’s does? Would it even be called madness since he keeps his wits about him enough to remove himself and Miranda safely from Milan (with, of course, his subjects’ help)?

² Prospero is one of two characters in Shakespeare’s corpus to admit he even has a library, the other one being the titular character in *Titus Andronicus*. The word “library” only appears three times throughout Shakespeare’s works, twice when Prospero explains his story to Miranda, once when Titus invites Lavinia into his library so they might read away their sorrows. Both men use their respective libraries incorrectly and their misreading of books translates into misreading people. For further analysis, see Chapter Four.

rate” (1.2.92). Both characters sequester themselves and create their individualized communities, and both undertake an education that guides them back to functionality.

In this chapter, I argue that Prospero’s status as dysfunctional reader leads directly to his exile from Milan, and that three catalysts begin his education back to functional readership. The first is his relationship with Caliban, who nearly usurps the island from him and who proves to him his own dysfunctional reading of island life. The second is Alonso’s arrival on the island, signaling Prospero’s imminent return to a society based on human interaction rather than a solitary, book-induced interpretive community. The third is Miranda’s betrothal to Ferdinand, which I will explore separately in the next chapter. All three catalysts together educate him on functional reading, and his concluding speech demonstrates his readiness to reenter Milan, reclaim his dukedom, and operate within a larger interpretive community rather than a solitary one built around magic. I begin by examining Prospero’s solitary interpretive community in Milan, then I analyze how his reading activities on the island mimic those in Milan. Finally, I analyze how he grows into the functional reader at the end of the play.

Previous scholarship on Prospero discusses the relationships between Prospero, his books, Miranda, and Caliban, but does not analyze his status as reader. Charlotte Scott calls the books an illusion, one with “no language...no rich landscape where the idea or object can be harvested or ploughed” (159) and one in which “knowledge appears to close down the active world of the living” (163). David M. Bergeron claims that Prospero “seeks to ‘textualize’ his life, give it a narrative form” (110), even as he gains his power from books. Alice Hall Petry parallels characters and scenarios within the narrative – most prominently Miranda and Caliban – and claims that Shakespeare means “to

demonstrate that both ‘natural’ knowledge and ‘book’ knowledge are inadequate for dealing with the world of human interrelationships” (27). While I agree that one or the other by themselves are inadequate, her wording implies the inadequacy of both together as well. For her, one cannot function properly in the living world unless they actually live, operate, and exist within it. Prospero has not done so for at least twelve years, possibly more since we do not know how many days or weeks he spent locked in his study. I argue, though, that he does depart the island prepared to function in the real world with a combination of book and natural knowledge, and an education garnered from reading the island’s inhabitants. Scholars discuss the books’ (lack of) physical presence onstage and Prospero’s relationship with them, but they do not discuss how he reads or engages with them. If we consider him the single member of one interpretive community, how does this change our reading of Prospero?

Don Quixote’s identity changes from hyper-informed to dysfunctional reader almost instantaneously, and it takes nearly the entire two-volume work for him to learn how to functionally read again. When we first meet Prospero on the island, he presents himself as both informed and hyper-informed reader, both functional and dysfunctional. He navigates this dichotomy for the entire play before ultimately leaving the island and thus claiming an identity as a functional reader. How can he be both? He behaves as each, depending on his location. Like Don Quixote, he constructs his own interpretive community centered on his readings; unlike Don Quixote, his books consist of texts meant to enrich the mind, not entertaining fiction. He studies the liberal arts and, presumably, he has at least one magical tome, which arrived on the island with him. Also like Don Quixote/Alonso Quijano, he withdraws from the rest of the world, and remains

in isolation with his books. He delegates all his ducal responsibilities onto his brother, Antonio, who takes advantage of Prospero's book obsession to run Milan as he sees fit. His reading directly leads to his exile as Antonio takes advantage of his brother's negligence to name himself the Duke of Milan and place his own supporters in positions of power. He exhibits a hyper-informed reading of his library, which in turn results in dysfunctional readership status in Milan. His interpretive community cannot operate outside of its chosen texts or its particular interpretive strategies. While residing in Milan, Prospero functions as a perfectly dysfunctional reader. The island is a different story. Once he arrives, he gradually learns how to be a functional reader, first by learning to read Caliban, then by using his "art" (his magic) to convert the island into a mini-dukedom. He needs his book and his magic to rule the island successfully; throughout *The Tempest*, we see Ariel performing wonders on Prospero's behalf. The book allows him to control the spirit, so Prospero's solitary community functions as any interpretive community would, while on the island. Caliban begins Prospero's education so that he may become a function reader/ruler of the island; Miranda finishes that education so he may be so in Milan.

At first glance, Prospero does not seem like a character in need of education – he devotes his time in Milan to educating himself, after all. Yet for all his bookish intellect, Prospero is ill-suited to reading people as well, a detail proven by his brother ousting him from the dukedom and Prospero's own misplaced trust in Caliban upon arrival on the island. On the island, Prospero remains the head of his interpretive community, but he no longer can call himself its only member. Miranda, Caliban, Ariel, the other spirits, all the island's inhabitants fall into his community as either extensions of himself or

subversions. As he learns to read the others, he actively fights when someone else tries to read him, his prowess with words creating a verbal chasm between himself and every character except Ariel. He superimposes his own readings of other people onto their actual characters: he accuses Ferdinand of usurping his father as King of Naples, a title Ferdinand claims when he believes his father dead and which suggests Prospero believes his disposition to be similar to Alonso's. He molds Miranda into a reader after himself, something she follows when she interacts with Caliban but resists when she meets her love interest. When he attempts to impose his own readings onto Caliban, the action backfires severely when Caliban attempts to rape Miranda, an action tantamount to robbing Prospero of a second dukedom. By the end, Prospero realizes that he must forfeit his physical books and his identity as the island's functional reader in order to become a functional reader in Milan.

Prospero's Literary Competence and Dysfunctional Reading in Milan

At first glance, Prospero seems like Fish's informed reader: he can read the texts in the languages in which they were written and he demonstrates his semantic knowledge throughout the entire drama (no other character in *The Tempest* is his equal), but how do we define his literary competence? On the one hand, we may define it based on the types of books he reads and how well he has internalized their contents. Since his subject matter consists of educational materials and not fiction, he seems – on the onset – perfectly positioned as an informed reader. Nothing could be further from the truth. Though we have little textual evidence concerning his books in Milan, what we do have provides a clue to his competence. When Prospero begins his story to Miranda, he makes three bold statements: first, he calls Antonio “perfidious” (1.2.68); second, he praises

himself by calling the dukedom of Milan “through all the signories it was the first” (1.2.71), thereby self-asserting his worth as a duke; and third, he explains the primary cause of his distraction, his books.

And Prospero, the prime Duke, being so reputed

In dignity, and for the liberal arts

Without a parallel; those being all my study

The government I cast upon my brother

And to my state grew stranger, being transported

And rapt in secret studies. (1.2.72-7)

His books brought him his fame in more ways than one; he was the duke loved by his people and who ruled prosperously over his dukedom, but he was also the one so engrossed in his studies of both the liberal arts and his own “art” (secret studies) that he became a hermit and allowed his brother to rule in his place. With so many hours spent sequestered with his books, he ostensibly possesses enough competence to internalize their properties of discourse. We see more evidence of his literary competence in his opening conversation with Miranda, this time with regards to his “art.”

...Wipe thou thine eyes, have comfort,

The direful spectacle of the wreck which touched

The very virtue of compassion in thee,

I have with such provision in mine art

So safely ordered, that there is no soul –

No, not so much perdition as an hair,

Betid to any creature in the vessel

Which thou heard'st cry, which thou sawst sink. (1.2.25-32)

After twelve years of island life, Prospero possesses more competence in his “art” and in presiding over his court of spirits. He knows even before conjuring the tempest that everyone onboard the ship will arrive safely on land (probably also anticipating Miranda’s response to the tempest), and he plans the remaining events to the last detail. His skill in his “art” allows him to separate Ferdinand from the rest of his party, as well as bring the ship safely in to harbor even though Miranda swears she saw it sink. If we assume literary competence in Fish’s sense of the word, then Prospero is the informed reader and we may move on. And rather than an informed reader, he is a hyper-informed reader...of books.

On the other hand, with regards to defining his competence, we may explain it based on how well he reads his fellow man. Prospero almost acts as an informed reader, which by extension would make him a functional reader in life, but he stumbles at the last step: he does not actively keep himself informed. His hyper-informed book knowledge grants him fame and allows him to work magic, all at the expense of his informed/functional reading of Milanese society. Fish articulates one last nuance to his concept of the informed reader, that they are “a real reader...who does everything within his power to make himself informed” (49).³ Prospero keeps himself hyper-informed with regards to his academics, but neglects his responsibilities to the point that he remains unaware of

³ This is one of Fish’s more complex statements as he prefaces this phrase by stating that the informed reader is a hybrid, “neither an abstraction nor an actual living reader, but a hybrid – a real reader (me) who does everything within his power...etc.” (49). He links the concept of the informed reader with authorial intent, saying that he can project his own interpretations onto his readers. He himself is the informed reader because he operates under a set of constraints from his methodology, and he is able to suppress any personal or idiosyncratic opinions. The informed reader becomes a blend of author and audience made by the reading experience, and any reader can shape him or herself into an informed reader if reliable and self-conscious enough.

Antonio's changes to the dukedom and his schemes against him. By the time Prospero realizes his mistake, it is too late to impede his brother's progress. Antonio has already:

Being once perfected how to grant suits,
How to deny them, who t'advance and who
To trash for overtopping, new created
The creatures that were mine, I saw, or changed 'em,
Or else new formed 'em; having both the key
Of officer and office, set all hearts i'th' state
To what tune pleased his ear...(1.2.79-85)

Antonio steadily replaces all of Prospero's subordinates with others loyal to him or convinces those loyal to Prospero to switch sides. Not content with that, he gains favor with the King of Naples and strikes a deal wherein Antonio pays tribute to the king in return for aid in ousting Prospero from Milan. All of this occurs while Prospero is (un)safely ensconced with his books and blissfully ignorant of the changes exacted under his nose. He does not learn of this until Gonzalo and others loyal to him smuggle him and Miranda onto a ship, only receiving the full story after an attempt on their lives. Prospero might have literary competence when it comes to the physical books, but he has almost none when it comes to the surrounding world, much like Don Quixote. If literary competence also means changing as the reading material changes, then Prospero fails to recognize that he must also interpret his brother's words and actions as Antonio's ambition grows, and fails to act when power corrupts Antonio's thoughts.

How does Prospero constantly misread his fellow man when 1) he has enough intelligence to read and correctly interpret his subject matter, and 2) his hyper-informed

reading occurs while reading texts on logic and rhetoric (among other things), not fiction. Part of the answer comes from his reading situation, in particular the lack of contact with any other interpretive communities. While Don Quixote clashes with every community he encounters, Prospero does not encounter any others before his stage time; he does not even interact with other book readers during the course of *The Tempest*. In fact, he specifically mentions his only interaction with readers occurred in Milan when Gonzalo,

Out of his charity – who, then being appointed
Master of this design – did give us, with
Rich garments, linens, stuffs and necessities,
Which since have steaded much; so of his gentleness,
Knowing I loved my books, he furnished me
From mine own library with volumes that
I prize above my dukedom. (1.2.162-168)

Gonzalo, the man who orchestrated Prospero and Miranda's escape from Milan, takes the time to acquire one or more books⁴ in Prospero's library and smuggle them to the escapees, along with food and clothes. From then until his leaving the island, Prospero encounters no other books, no other readers, and, by extension, no other interpretive communities. How, then, does the reading experience proceed for him when he cannot enter into debate with another community?

⁴ Notably, out of the three times Prospero uses the word "book," this speech when he mentions Gonzalo is the only time he uses the plural "books." Judging by this line alone, we may presume that Gonzalo brought him his book of magic along with a few other volumes he cherished. The other two times Prospero says "book," however, he refers to his collection on the island and uses the singular noun instead. Which is it then? Either he has a few books with him to fill his contemplative hours, or he only has the one that gives him the strength to raise the tempest.

Put simply, he misinterprets because he has no contacts with other groups. An interpretive community functions when multiple people use a shared strategy to interpret a text; Prospero does not have such connections. Because no one else in Milan can penetrate his book-induced isolation, no one can argue for or against his interpretations and no one is present to remind him of his duties to his dukedom. His intellect, his prowess with words, and his “art” all prove useless when Antonio decides to usurp him, simply because it does not occur to him to use those same skills on his brother. Prospero sees only physical books as things to read, but either underestimates his brother or assumes that he does not need to read people as well, or both. When presented with the opportunity to learn from his mistakes on the island, he not only does not seize the opportunity but he almost repeats the same mistake. The only difference between the two places is the person (or creature) he fails to correctly interpret. Shakespeare scholar – Edward Berry – comments:

A similar ambivalence characterizes Shakespeare’s treatment of Prospero’s learning and art.⁵ By the end of the play Prospero has attempted both, and with ambiguous results. In Milan he achieved great learning, not only of magic but also of all ‘the liberal arts,’ in which he was ‘without a parallel’(I.ii.73-4). But in the pursuit of wisdom he became a ‘stranger’ to his state, ‘transported/And rapt in secret studies’ (I.ii.76-7)...

⁵ By “similar ambivalence,” Berry compares Prospero’s two pursuits of learning and art to the pursuits of truth and invention, the two that Pierre Charron claims, in *Of Wisedome*, are most important to the human spirit.

On the island Prospero uses his 'art' to recover his state. Through his magic he brings his enemies into his power and effectuates, or at least makes possible, their moral reform. But the dukedom is not recovered until Prospero has in some sense re-experienced its original loss. In the 'vanity' of his 'art,' he once more neglects worldly ends and nearly loses his life. (46)

While Berry correctly summarizes Prospero's successes and failures in both learning and art, he fails to articulate that both pursuits center around one object: the book. Those books ultimately result in not only the loss of his dukedom, but also his functionality as a reader and his home in Milan.

The Island as a Mimic of Milan

How do Prospero's hyper-informed interpretive community and his identity as dysfunctional reader result in the island mimicking the circumstances in Milan? First and foremost, Scott remarks how both locations share one common object: "The book is what Milan and the island share and what apparently begins and ends the drama of Prospero: it is an object of possession and destruction, of aspiration and valediction. What seems to bring the two worlds together is the transformative power of illusion..." (159-160). Scott continues by saying that magic shapes the order and narrative of the play, but the magic likewise comes from Prospero's book repository within his cave. Prospero craves order, both as a duke and as a reader, and he uses that order "to establish justice and to win men to repentance" (Durrant 51). The island forms the perfect place for him to resume his identity as ruler, as a place of complete chaos with the spirits and Caliban running rampant. His "art" allows him some control of Ariel and the spirits, and whenever Ariel

begins to question his master's wishes, all Prospero need do is remind the sprite of his promised freedom so long as he continue to do Prospero's bidding. Scott argues that the books act as an allegory for Prospero's need for the order he lost in Milan and that he seeks to create in a land populated with magic:

The journey which the books make from Milan to the island, from usurpation to the command of spirits, and the retaining of their significance and shape in both places, suggests their allegorical function in the play. The role of the books in both narratives appears to promise disclosure or revelation, definition or design. Within the play, however, Prospero's books fulfill none of these roles. Whilst on the one hand they offer an image of the world through which *The Tempest* will move; on the other, they deny us a vision of that world. What we see instead is the illusion of order and the chaos of art. (158)

The phrase "the illusion of order and the chaos of art" (158) perfectly summarizes Prospero's situation after he abandons his dukedom in favor of reading. While in Milan, he operates under the (mis)assumption that Antonio rules over his dominion in the same manner that Prospero himself did, an illusion of order. However, Prospero's fascination with books leads to chaos in his and his daughter's lives, which then reoccurs years later on the island. Even though he does attempt to create order in his new home, something many of the characters quickly realize is that order does not exist on this island.⁶ Gonzalo remarks on their survival, "for the miracle/I mean our preservation, few in millions/Can

⁶ Scott also mentions that the book remains "concealed from the 'fabric of this vision'" (160), the audience's vision because the book "supports the linear form of narrative" (160) while the island cannot. Prospero learns his "art" from his books, the books create the illusions the others characters witness, yet they cannot sustain the illusions simply because they do not appear onstage.

“speak like us” (2.1.6-8), then comments in the same conversation that their clothes “being, as they were, drenched in the sea, hold notwithstanding their freshness and gloss, being rather new-dyed than stained with salt water” (2.1.63-5), and then later wakes when he hears Ariel humming in his ear “And that a strange one too” (2.1.319). Magic abounds, the spirits at the masque all follow Prospero’s direction, and the island becomes a mini-dukedom in which Prospero uses his books to “form the infrastructure of his mini-state, tutoring his daughter, his erstwhile companion, now slave, Caliban, and his command over Ariel. Wherever these books may lie, and whatever they are, they appear to operate an invisible government, directing, supporting, and enabling manifestations of Prospero’s authority” (Scott 163). His dual identity as magician and duke aids him in creating and operating his new court, the exact opposite of the events in Milan.

Shakespeare scholar, David M. Bergeron, remarks that:

Shakespeare raises the matter of responsible reading – how one sorts out the responsibilities of this world in light of a concern for and interest in reading books...It isn’t enough, Shakespeare seems to be suggesting, merely to acquire books, start a new Bodleian library, or to be rapt in the secret studies of a private reader. Another world exists out there: the rough-and-tumble world of human politics. (109)

While Prospero hardly practiced responsible reading in Milan, he begins to do so on the island, which allows for harmony between his book knowledge, practical knowledge of governing, and natural knowledge regarding the island’s structure. He still devotes hours in the day to reading, as Miranda remarks to Ferdinand when she speaks to him against her father’s orders, “My father/Is hard at study; pray now, rest yourself” (3.1.20-21).

While the island hardly counts as the world of human politics, Prospero seems well prepared to handle them when the delegation from Naples arrives. It seems, then, that he balances his reading with governing the island, which should lead to a functional reader at least within this context.

Yet for all Prospero's attempt to create this mini-dukedom, dysfunctional reading still impedes him. He has grown somewhat in that his literary competence has changed; he utilizes his books to keep court on the island, and his interactions with Ariel show command over his literary interpretations. When Ariel reports on the tempest's results, Prospero praises him, "Ariel, thy charge/Exactly is performed" (1.2.237-238), then responds to a rebuke with, "I will be correspondent to command/And so my spriting gently" (1.2.297-298). However, if his books are the basis of his control over the spirits, then Ariel is just an extension of the books. The same interpretive strategies he uses to read the books he can also easily employ on his servant, knowing that Ariel has no choice but to obey him if the sprite wants to obtain his freedom. Similar to what Giorno says about the relationship between master and sprite, "Ariel 'Perform'd to point the tempest' (1.2.194) thus fulfilling the calling word of Prospero...Prospero communicates with Ariel who in turn gives 'special effects' to his master's words" (204). Ariel may be the only character with whom Prospero effectively communicates since the master's books and "art" create a bond between them sustained by words and by reading. In terms of reading other people, his interactions with Miranda and Caliban in the first three acts demonstrate how little he has grown as a reader since escaping Milan, and Prospero can only begin his education back to functional readership when confronted with a second usurpation.

When *The Tempest* begins, Prospero's interpretive community has expanded to include Miranda, Ariel, and the sprites. Years before, it also included Caliban. Caliban resembles Antonio both in motivation and in how Prospero reacts to him. He explains how Prospero once treated him as both son and servant, the former in that he instructs Caliban side-by-side with Miranda, "Thou strok'st me and made much of me; wouldst give me/Water with berries in't, and teach me how/To name the bigger light and how the less/That burned by day and night. And then I loved thee" (1.2.334-337), and the latter in that he still steals Caliban's birthright by establishing his own court amongst the sprites, "This island's mine by Sycorax, my mother/Which thou tak'st from me" (1.2.332-333). This time, instead of allowing someone else to take advantage of him and usurp his position, Prospero actively engages with both books and living creatures. In this way, he can build (or attempt to build) his own literary competence while simultaneously protecting his daughter and relearning how to be a duke. He shares his book knowledge with both Caliban and Miranda, but instead of learning how to read them, he manipulates them both into his doing his will. This almost results in disaster for both father and daughter. Caliban awakens to the manipulation far earlier than Miranda does; she does not metaphorically open her eyes until Ferdinand arrives and she beholds another man for the first time. On the other hand, Caliban gleans enough from Prospero's teachings to realize how he may reclaim his birthright, which leads to his attempt to rape Miranda. Caliban knows that to assert ownership over Miranda would effectively emasculate and usurp Prospero, weakening him enough that Caliban could assume control over the island even without Prospero's books and "art." Again, Prospero does not read the people around him, either because he is oblivious or arrogant. That obliviousness and/or

arrogance demonstrates his continued dysfunctionality, serving as the first catalyst that prompts his education back to functionality.

When Prospero reminds Caliban of the violence almost inflicted upon Miranda, “I have used thee/(Filth as thou art) with humane care and lodged thee/In mine own cell, till thou didst seek to violate/The honour of my child” (1.2.346-349), his words mirror what he previously said about Antonio,

...in my false brother
Awaked an evil nature, and my trust,
Like a good parent, did beget of him
As my trust was, which indeed had no limit,
A confidence sans bound. (1.2.92-6)

Prospero’s first words to describe Antonio “false brother,” parallel with one of his first addresses to Caliban, “lying slave.” While he does not say that he placed “trust, which indeed had no limit” in his servant, he clearly did not expect the other to violate Miranda either. Between Caliban’s plot to “people else/This isle with Calibans” (1.2.350-351) and Miranda’s blossoming into early womanhood, Prospero fails to read what is right in front of him and almost loses his second dukedom to the creature from which he took it, a creature whose “sexual potency threatens Prospero’s political stability” (Shin 376).

Prospero continuously misreads Caliban during the remainder of the play, and does so again when he underestimates Caliban’s vindictive streak. After Caliban swears his allegiance to Stephano and Trinculo in Act II Scene 2, we do not see them again until Act III Scene 2, when Ariel speaks in their voices and nearly persuades them to turn against each other. Caliban, by this point, has devised a plan to depose Prospero and place

Stephano as lord of the island, a plan that requires they “possess his books, for without them/He’s but a sot, as I am, nor hath not/One spirit to command” (3.2.92-4). For a second time, Prospero’s books and assumed dysfunctionality threaten his hold over his dominion. I say assumed because, as previously stated, Prospero uses book and natural knowledge conjointly to govern the island effectively. Due to Caliban’s previous attempt against father and daughter, Prospero has become a more functional reader of the island, mostly because he has an ally who does his bidding. Caliban becomes a more physically-monstrous version of Antonio, ready to use the books to destroy everything Prospero holds dear. Since the books help Prospero control the island rather than distract him from it, Caliban demands that they acquire them and burn them, thereby metaphorically dethroning Prospero before finishing the job and killing him.

All of this occurs while Prospero, yet again, remains blissfully unaware in his cave. Prospero has a better distraction this time, manipulating Ferdinand and Miranda into marriage and love, but he still allows a distraction to blind him to his enemy’s wrongdoings, thereby depriving himself of the opportunity to completely grow beyond the dysfunctional reader. He remains unaware of Caliban’s plot until Ariel remarks “This will I tell my master” (3.2.115) and snitches on Caliban offstage during the interval before the next act. Either Prospero does not believe Caliban is worth exercising his reading talents, or he knows that between Ariel and his “art,” he can keep his servant in check. Either way, Prospero does not bother reading Caliban enough to contain him when the royal entourage reaches shore. He focuses on the enemy he knows he can easily defeat with magic, Antonio and Sebastian, rather than the one who knows his weakness.

His treatment of Caliban proves that he cannot read his enemies until forced to, but this begs the question, how does this translate into his interactions with Miranda, the one next in line to rule over the island? If not careful, he would teach her to make the same mistakes he did. He almost does. Prospero does not so much read Miranda as mold her into a reader like himself.⁷ Fate delivers Prospero's enemies right to his doorstep, but if Alonso's ship had not sailed so close to the island, then he must groom Miranda to become queen once he is dead. His interactions with her show more of a teacher-student relationship than a paternal one; when he recounts their flight from Milan, he asks her five variations of the same question, "Dost thou attend me?" (1.2.78), "Dost thou hear?" (106) – one of those five times is more of a rebuke than a question, "Thou attend'st not" (87), forcing her to defend herself – and at one point praises her for her inquisitiveness, "Well demanded, wench/My tale provokes that question" (139-40). She knows of his "art" and likely knows that it derives from a book, yet she has no access to the book itself, and therefore cannot develop any literary competence distinct from his. She adopts his language towards Caliban as her own, calling him "abhorred slave" (1.2.352), "savage," (356), "brutish" (358), and "who hadst deserved more than a prison" (363), all within the same brief monologue. While she does not curse Caliban in quite the same way her father does, her word choices towards him bespeak someone following along with what the superior says rather than someone stating their own opinion. Prospero admits that he educated Miranda after their arrival "...here/Have I, thy schoolmaster, made thee more profit/Than other princes can that have more time for vainer hours"

⁷ While I also make reference to this in Chapter Four, this chapter focuses on Prospero's motives for shaping Miranda's reading experience, while the later chapter examines how Miranda completes Prospero's education as a functional reader.

(1.2.171-173), but he shapes her into a reader after himself. Reader after himself means two things: reliant (perhaps overly reliant) on book knowledge and inexperienced in dealing with other humans. As Petry notes:

Clearly, neither Miranda with her considerable book knowledge nor Caliban with his great natural knowledge is capable of dealing effectively with the real world of human interrelationships, a state of affairs indicated not only by the aforementioned tremendous power which the human Prospero wields over them both, but also by the rather shocking fact that neither Miranda nor Caliban knows a human when he is looking at one, let alone trying to deal with one. Given this situation, one may at this point surmise that Shakespeare is suggesting that the only way one can acquire knowledge of the real world of humans is to live actually in it. (31)⁸

Miranda's naivety in her interactions with Ferdinand and Alonso is understandable, something that Prospero seems to regret when she remarks, "O brave new world/That has such people in't" (5.1.183-4) and he answers "'Tis new to thee" (184). We may also argue that it is new to him as well, since he must reenter the human world for the first time in twelve years, longer if we count his self-imposed book isolation in Milan. The debacle in Milan derived from a total lack of contact with the human world and an existence focused exclusively on books, whereas success on the island comes from a mix of Prospero's book knowledge, which allows him to control the spirits, and the

⁸ Petry makes a point when she says that Miranda does not know how to deal with other people due to her lack of experience in the human world; she also hypothesizes that Naples or Milan will be a large culture shock for the young woman. However, I do not entirely agree that she is incapable of dealing with the human world; inexperienced and naïve certainly, but not incapable. Miranda's dialogue with Ferdinand shows her beginning to break away from her father's reading mold and grow into a more competent reader herself. For further information, see Chapter Four: Female Transformations.

knowledge Caliban granted him while under his tutelage. Prospero comes to realize he must transition back into the human world, a continuation of the education that Caliban commenced and which can only proceed when Alonso, Ferdinand, and Antonio arrive at his shores.

Prospero's Continued Education

How, then, does Prospero become the functional reader towards the end of the play when he has spent twelve years in seclusion on the island with books and only Caliban and Miranda to (mis)read? He begins when Ariel guides Ferdinand to his cave and arranges for the young man to behold Miranda. Prospero has many asides, both to himself and to Ariel, throughout this part of the scene; in the first, he notes, "The Duke of Milan/And his more braver daughter could control thee" (1.2.439-440), which proves two things: 1) he anticipates that Miranda will read Ferdinand in at least a manner similar to his own reading, and 2) he knows that between his conjured tempest and Ferdinand's current malleability, he can manipulate the young man into whatever he wants. Right after he decides that "this swift business/I must uneasy make" (1.2.451-452), he accuses Ferdinand of usurping his father's title as the King of Naples. Declaring himself as king is a reasonable assertion for Ferdinand to make – he does, after all, believe his father drowned – but Prospero not only accuses him of lying, but specifically uses the phrase "usurp/The name that ow'st not" (454-455). By using that particular word choice, Prospero places Ferdinand in the same category as Antonio and, as he later learns from Ariel, Sebastian. Both his grudge against his brother and his distrust of Ferdinand's parentage – Alonso and Prospero were enemies even before the latter retired to his library dukedom – show his retention of past lessons learned from Antonio, Alonso, and Caliban.

Ferdinand possesses none of the book knowledge, natural knowledge, strength, or skill that Prospero does; if Ferdinand challenges him, the young man will lose. Prospero reiterates this when he rebukes Miranda for leaping to Ferdinand's defense.

Silence! One word more

Shall make me chide thee, if not hate thee. What,

An advocate for an imposter? Hush.

Thou think'st there is no more such shapes as he,

Having seen but him and Caliban. Foolish wench,

To th' most of men, this is a Caliban,

And they to him are angels. (1.2.476-482)

Prospero uses his daughter's naivety against her, even though he knows that she will have read Ferdinand as well. Mentioning Caliban recalls the attempted rape, which would both force her to reconsider her first impression of Ferdinand – even though she is convinced he is “gentle and not fearful” (1.2.469) – while also revealing his reading of Ferdinand. He warns her that Ferdinand would do her to what Caliban attempted to do and that better men exist than him. This prepares her to face a world of more men outside the island, including the men that originally drove them from Milan. At this point, Miranda still belongs to Prospero's interpretive community while Ferdinand believes the rest of his dead. By the end, both men will belong to hers (see next chapter).

Here, Prospero begins to show his continued education regarding reading other people, but he does so in the wrong place. He reads Ferdinand as usurper and potential rapist, even though both titles more aptly belong to Caliban. Even so, he knows that the only way to win is for Ferdinand and Miranda to marry, but he must also use his book

knowledge and what he remembers of social convention to coerce them. For Prospero to use both against his visitors demonstrates his awareness that he must reenter the human circle, and to do that, he must begin to distance himself from his books. Magic governs the island; it will not govern Milan. Prospero's interpretive community, hyper-informed in bookish studies while in Milan and hyper-informed in magic on the island, begins to abjure the texts around which it build its interpretive strategies. To become a functional reader in Milan, his community must learn to coexist with other human ones without bibliographic intervention.

As the play progresses, he employs rhetoric rather than magic to influence Ferdinand and Miranda further into love's embrace, such as when Miranda contradicts her father on Ferdinand's behalf: "Make not too rash a trial of him" (1.2.468) and "Sir, have pity/I'll be his surety" (1.2.475-476). At the same time, is such a harsh tone really necessary? Perhaps yes, strictly denying his daughter something she wants is the easiest way to ensure she takes action to acquire it. However, Durrant remarks that "neither Ferdinand nor Miranda has deserved the harsh abuse that Prospero conscientiously heaps on them, and there must surely be a natural movement of revulsion against the morality that can prompt Prospero to abuse a stranger" (54). The natural movement of revulsion meant to come from the audience seems more like one of sympathy when placed into context. On the one hand, Prospero reads Ferdinand in the same way he later reads Antonio and Sebastian, so his harsh words could be seen as an effort to protect Miranda. On the other hand, Ferdinand's arrival heralds Prospero's reentrance to the human world when the book world has been his refuge for more than a decade. The knowledge that he must leave his safety net generates fear which manifests itself as anger.

As the narrative progresses, his words towards the couple get even harsher, up to the point that Miranda even remarks “Never till this day/Saw I him touched with anger so distempered” (4.1.144-145). The simple explanation for this fit of “passion” (143, Ferdinand’s word) is that Prospero suddenly remembers he still has to vanquish Caliban’s latest scheme, “The minute of their plot/Is almost come” (4.1.141-142). The more complex explanation is that Prospero’s anger derives from an external stimulus the audience cannot see. Lindenbaum comments how

...on several occasions the anger appears out of all proportion to the apparent stimulus giving rise to it. Prospero’s perturbation as he interrupts the masque and bids his performing spirits vanish is a good case in point. The immediate cause of Prospero’s interruption of the masque – and of his anger – is evidently Caliban and his conspiracy... Yet once Prospero directs his thoughts to Caliban’s conspiracy again, he disposes of it with consummate ease. Given this disparity between Prospero’s anger and the ostensible cause for it, what Frank Kermode has (I believe correctly) called the inadequate motivation for Prospero’s anger, the scene in effect demands that we ask why Prospero is so angry. (163)

Lindenbaum argues the masque itself raises Prospero’s anger,⁹ then later the protagonist feels angry at reacting so strongly, but his anger is understandable if we read it as fear instead. By now, Prospero has nearly completed his education as a functional reader of

⁹ More specifically, he argues that Ferdinand’s comment “Let me live here forever!” (4.1.122) reminds Prospero that the world around him is insubstantial. They cannot remain within the masque’s pastoral setting forever simply because it is not real and because if they did, they would give Caliban free reign to do as he pleases (Lindenbaum 164). Between the masque and Caliban’s plot, Prospero’s anger is easily justified.

society outside his interpretive community. He has built his literary competence enough that he can read his visitors, and he uses both his books and his knowledge of their characters to manipulate them to his will – Ferdinand by influencing his feelings for Miranda, and Alonso by revealing Sebastian and Antonio’s plot earlier in Act III – all of this in preparation to leave the island. When Prospero tells Ferdinand “Sir, I am vexed/Bear with my weakness, my old brain is troubled/Be not disturbed with my infirmity” (4.1.158-160), to what infirmity does he refer? The infirmity is his current status as functional reader within the island, which generates from a combination of books and nature. Upon transitioning from islander functional reader to Milanese functional reader, he will become a weaker reader (in that Ariel and his “art” will not be at his disposal) but still a functional one capable of governing a duchy.

Certainly, Prospero’s functionality is stronger on the island, specifically because it includes magical intervention. At the end of Act III, he steps away from his book-magic interpretive community so that he can employ a mix of book knowledge and human awareness against Alonso. The first time he confronts Alonso’s entourage, he watches from above as Ariel recites a monologue that details Antonio and Alonso’s actions in Milan, “for which foul deed/The powers delaying, not forgetting, have/Incensed the seas and shores” (3.3.72-74) and warns them that “Ling’ring perdition, worse than any death/Can be at once, shall step by step attend/You and your ways, whose wraths to guard you from...is nothing but heart’s sorrow/And a clear life ensuing” (3.3.77-9, 81-2). By this point, Prospero knows of Sebastian’s plot against Alonso, knows that Antonio suggested the idea, and so foregrounds Antonio’s previous actions in an attempt to dissuade them from their plan. At the same time, he uses words meant to guilt Alonso for

aiding Antonio, and that retribution comes in the form of Ferdinand's death. By now, Prospero can read his enemies well enough to know the most effective words to use against them, notes that "they now are in my power" (3.3.90), and knows that can keep himself apprised of their movements through Ariel.

When Ariel finally brings Alonso and the others to the cave, they find Prospero waiting for them, ready to both rebuke and forgive them. He embraces Gonzalo, reprimands Antonio and Sebastian, "You, brother mine, that entertained ambition/Expelled remorse and nature, whom with Sebastian/Whose inward pinches therefore are most strong/Would here have killed your king" (5.1.75-78), and demonstrates both to both his audiences – the island and the theater – his completed education to functionality and his lessened dependence on books. Giorgio states that Prospero enacts the word once he has read it because "By his forgiveness of his unnatural countrymen, Prospero acts the meaning of 'brother' as it calls to be acted. Prospero unites a stranded word with its significance, and this sense of unity allows him to forgive the unnatural" (208). Forgiveness constitutes another act of reading; Prospero's addressing Antonio as brother shows that even though he may be willing to forgive the other, he also will not be fooled again (or at least not by the same man).

One last question, however: would he be fooled again? His strength on the island derives from a mixture of book knowledge, natural knowledge, and some human interaction. I do believe that Shakespeare suggests one must live in the human world in order to navigate it, as Petry suggests, but Prospero's strength comes from reading. Simultaneously, I believe Shakespeare argues the necessity of reading, as long as done in moderation. Too much reading results in Antonio's betrayal, while a moderate amount of

book reading combined with other forms of reading allows the exiled duke to flourish on the island. Before Ariel arrives with Alonso, Prospero decides “I’ll drown my book” (5.1.57) and says in the Epilogue “Now my charms are all o’erthrown/And what strength I have’s mine own/Which is most faint” (1-3). Does he have enough strength to continue as duke without his books? The answer is both yes and no: yes, since they initially impeded his functionality and he has since learned how to grow without them; no, since he only becomes the island’s functional reader with Ariel’s help and he controls Ariel through his book. Corfield states that “Ariel seems partly responsible for the change in Prospero’s mind – the change which leads to forgiveness. It is Ariel’s moving account of Prospero’s enemies and his appeal to the magician’s humanity that seems to evoke a corresponding sympathy in Prospero” (40) because Prospero’s quest for vengeance has made him “lose all sense of direction for his magic” (42). While I do believe Prospero has lost all sense of direction, I believe he does because he realizes there is no place for his magic in Milan. His “art” controls the spirits on the island, which allows him to create order from chaos; in Milan, he only needs human interaction to create that order. On the other hand, he succeeds on the island because Ariel and his “art” shape him into a functional reader that govern that land. He acknowledges that without his “art,” he possesses quite little strength, hinting that drowning the book might not be in his best interests. Instead of arguing against reading, Shakespeare does something similar to what Cervantes does in the *escrutinio*: he argues against reading in excess and that in order to read people, one must know how to live in the human world.

In conclusion, Prospero acts as dysfunctional reader in Milan, begins his reign on the island as a dysfunctional reader as well, and only becomes a functional reader/ruler on

the island when Caliban begins Powers's education process and attempts to rape Miranda – a particularly violent means of gaining awareness. Caliban serves as the first catalyst that induces Prospero's education back to functional readership, the second being Ferdinand and Alonso's arrival, as I have analyzed here. Prospero becomes a functional reader because he uses book knowledge, natural knowledge, and human knowledge to his advantage, so when he renounces his books at the end of the play, he does so because he knows he must rely solely on his own awareness and skill of reading others, all without the assistance of magic or Ariel. This is similar to how Berry describes Prospero's willing reentry into Milanese society: "In renouncing his 'rough magic,' Prospero accepts his limitations as a man and re-enters the human community. To do so is to become vulnerable, but it is also to achieve a wisdom paradoxically beyond the reach of 'art' ... But there is strength as well as vulnerability in humanity: Prospero will rule his dukedom with a keener sense of his own and others' limitations" (47). Berry's key phrase in this passage is "human community;" in Milan and initially on the island, Prospero badly dysfunctions as a reader because of his limited access with human communities. Only when he admits during the Epilogue that "what strength I have's mine own" (2) does he renounce not only his book but his solitary interpretive community. By renouncing his physical books, the source of his magic, Prospero reclaims his functionality and leaves the island prepared to resume his place as Duke of Milan.

CHAPTER IV

SHAKESPEARE'S FEMALE PROTAGONISTS AS EDUCATORS AND FUNCTIONAL READERS

One object connects every character I have analyzed thus far: the book. Even though a wide array of Shakespeare's characters – protagonists and secondary characters – could be construed as readers, I have selected only those whose physical access to books generates their stories. Prospero's solitary interpretive community directly parallels with Don Quixote's, and both receive similar educations about functional reading. Three stimuli catalyze Prospero's education, two of which – Caliban's attempted rape of Miranda, and Alonso and Ferdinand's arrival – were discussed in the last chapter. In this chapter, I discuss the third stimulus: Prospero's daughter, Miranda. While Prospero remains the obvious character with whom to associate books in *The Tempest*, that does not necessarily make him the only one. In some of her earliest dialogue, we learn of Miranda's connection with books, specifically her younger years under her father's tutelage. He raises her and educates her in presumably a humanist education befitting a sixteenth-century lady, yet we never see Miranda interact with a book onstage (though, to be fair, we never see Prospero do so either). As stated in the previous chapter, Prospero's book helps him keep command over the island and maintain a functional reader status while he governs the island. Why, then, does Miranda not have the same access to a book that would surely help her, especially since her body remains under threat from Caliban?

Furthermore, even though Prospero no doubt possesses one or many books upon the island and has sequestered them away so that Miranda and, more importantly, Caliban do not get hold of them, what information do we have about other interpretive communities on the island?

I argue that Miranda serves as the remaining catalyst that coerces Prospero back to functional readership, but in order for her to be that catalyst, she must adopt functional readership herself. Prospero knows that in order to escape the island alive, he must arrange a marriage between Ferdinand and Miranda; however, her role in his education is stronger than that. She educates her father in functional reading by assuming control of his interpretive community upon meeting Ferdinand. She diverges from her father's community by speaking to Ferdinand after Prospero tells her not to, remarking on her father's uncharacteristic temper, and warning her new husband against cheating at a game of chess. Even though her sheltered existence only grants her interpreting knowledge of books and her father, she learns how to read Ferdinand remarkably quickly. Her interactions with Caliban bespeak a daughter following her father's example; those with Ferdinand bespeak a woman growing into her own.

Critics have examined Miranda and Prospero's relationship, both as father-daughter and as teacher-student: Hiewon Shin argues that Prospero "diverges from the Renaissance humanists' prescriptions of proper education for women" (382) by teaching Miranda how and when to speak, which could be construed as a woman seeking power over men; Lorie Jerrell Leininger and Frank Kermode both note Miranda's deference to Prospero and how his educating her nurtures her, while Geraldo de Sousa claims that Prospero bestows upon his daughter "a European education and courtly manners, raising

her to assume her dynastic destiny and become Ferdinand's bride and future queen of Naples" (175). How can Prospero raise her to such a status unless he foresaw Ferdinand's arrival? No one as of yet has studied in depth Miranda's relationship with her father's books and her identity as a reader, functional or otherwise. I argue instead that Prospero grooms Miranda to govern the island upon his death, molding her into a reader that functions within the island's interpretive community, but when Prospero conjures the tempest, plans change and suddenly Miranda must educate herself in functional readership so that she may likewise educate her own father. Miranda becomes the head of her own interpretive community, which then begs the question what event induces her transition to functional reader? Is it her introduction to Ferdinand or something else? Additionally, do any other of Shakespeare's female protagonists rework their interpretive communities similar to how Miranda rebuilds Prospero's?

If Prospero devotes his time both in Milan and on the island to his books, so much so that his interpretive community leads to dysfunctional readership in Milan and almost on the island, then we may reasonably call Miranda the daughter of a book. At first, a study of Miranda's relationship to books and subsequent identity as a reader may seem counterintuitive because, even after hearing her father's story in Act I Scene 2, Miranda does not demonstrate any interest in the books themselves and seems not to even think of them again. Once he finishes narrating their flight from Milan, Prospero enchants his daughter into sleep so he can plan how to manipulate Ferdinand, Alonso, and the others; when she wakes, she almost immediately encounters Caliban. From that point onward, any mention of books comes from either Prospero or Caliban, while Miranda fixates on her budding relationship with Ferdinand. During her time on the island, she exists within

an interpretive community led by Prospero and which consists only of herself and Prospero – and, for part of her childhood, Caliban. This allows Prospero to mold Miranda into his reading style, a mold she only grows out of it when she encounters other men, all without the assistance of books.

She may not think about the books, but Caliban certainly does. His instructions to Stephano and Trinculo specifically state to steal Prospero's books, "for without them/He's but a sot, as am I, nor hath not/One spirit to command" (III.2.92-94). Seven lines down though, Caliban references his mother, Sycorax, and provides a clue to his motives. He knows that controlling the books would mean controlling Prospero by extension, but what if the paper copies were not the only ones on the island? Just as Miranda has never seen men apart from her father prior to Ferdinand's arrival on the island, so has Caliban never seen a woman apart from Miranda. In Act I, Prospero mentions Caliban's one-time attempt to rape Miranda, but it goes deeper than that. Since Prospero grooms Miranda to succeed him in governing the island, Caliban's raping her would strip her of any narrative agency and also force her to carry his progeny, thereby securing a hereditary line to rule the island and endowing them with her stolen agency. Prospero, however, recognizes the other's plan (albeit a bit late – when Caliban attempts the rape, Prospero still dysfunctions as a reader even on the island), and prevents Miranda's violation in order to preserve his governance.

Miranda becomes aware of her own status as dysfunctional reader upon escaping Caliban's violation. That does not mean, however, that she grows into a functional reader immediately afterward. Her interactions with Prospero demonstrate a competence that leaves much to be desired. Whenever Miranda attempts to speak to her father, his

prowess with words leaves her own words “literally stranded somewhere outside of [her] control” (Giorno 203).¹ Prospero’s expertise derives from his many hours spent with books, leaving him unable to communicate effectively with other people, including his own daughter. Verbally, Miranda finds herself isolated from her father, so if we substitute her narrative role with that of a violated, metaphorically mute woman, how much more difficult would that act of reading become? Claiming a new identity as a reader allows the woman to teach others to read her while also reclaiming her body as her own, a subject of some debate in Elizabethan England: “The collectivity of the early modern self was particularly intense for women, who were so readily redefined by marriage.” (Gowing 818).² While ultimately redefined by marriage, Miranda redefines herself by learning to read first her father, then her husband-to-be. While redefining herself, she simultaneously educates both herself and her father, so when the play concludes, Miranda determines the strategies employed by her familial interpretive community.

While words prove ineffective in other dramas, Miranda learns to use them productively to grow into a functional reader and become tutor to both Prospero and Ferdinand. She asserts her identities as daughter, future wife, and independent reader – one capable of functioning both on the island within her father’s community, and within

¹ According to Giorno, Ferdinand finds himself in a similar position, isolated from Miranda and his father because of Prospero. He cannot court her and she cannot defend him because Prospero uses language as a means to keep them separated. Prospero uses “language to make something true or false” (203), and by extension, he puts words in Ariel’s mouth that spare Gonzalo from Antonio and Sebastian’s schemes. The tempest itself becomes a storm of words “that causes the character’s to face whatever they refuse to consider about their words and deeds” (203).

² Gowing’s research examines how a woman could claim her own body in Elizabethan England, which raises questions on how Shakespeare’s heroines assert their identities as women, as bodies, and as readers. While I will limit myself to studying Miranda’s interactions within her own interpretive community for the purposes of this project, I intend in a future project to conduct a feminist critique of Miranda, specifically to show how female protagonists materialize their bodies (using Butler’s definitions of materiality and performativity) into readable objects in order to reassert their identities and reclaim their agency within their own narratives.

her own community in Milan – and thereby rewrites the strategies that govern her interpretive community; suddenly, she controls it, Prospero does not. In this way, she assumes leadership of her community, and her father and husband-to-be can learn to read her as she learns how to read them.

The Daughter of a Book

Miranda belongs to a very limited interpretive community: herself and her father. Prospero's manipulations around the island show the reader exactly who determines that community and its strategies. We may assume that any literary and/or social competence Miranda possesses, she learns exclusively from her father. However, if he dysfunctions as a reader for at least part of his tenure on the island, what does that make her by extension? I will first examine how Miranda takes after her father in her reading abilities, then show how she uses her infatuation with Ferdinand to educate both her father and herself in functional reading.

From her introduction, Miranda asserts herself as a strong female character regarding how she speaks. She still shows deference to Prospero, calling him “my dearest father” on her first line and “good sir” on multiple occasions, but simultaneously demonstrates a sharper tone (and what some critics have called a lack of modesty³) in her first remarks towards Caliban. She is not afraid to call him “slave” (1.2.352), “savage” (356) or “brutish” (358), and vocalizes her past experiences with him in a way other women her age would not. She adapts masculine discourse in an obvious copy of her father, a move that eroticizes her body and use of language. While she only speaks so harshly to

³ Ildikó Limpár defines Miranda in terms of her sexuality, compares her with Sycorax, and asks if that sexuality marks Miranda's as angelic or demonic, while Marie Sturgiss notes Miranda's disobedience to Prospero when she visits Ferdinand, something no respectable woman would do.

Caliban, her opening lines demonstrate her willingness to speak plainly to Prospero. She loves and admires him, plays her part as the dutiful daughter, and successfully fulfills the plan he orchestrates for her (that of marrying Ferdinand); that does not mean she will not argue with him. His prowess with words exhibits more cunning than hers does and he often talks circles around her, but she still has no qualms in confronting him over the tempest and expressing her sorrows for the people onboard ship, "O, I have suffered/With those that I saw suffer" (1.2.5-6). She demands an explanation from him and he answers with, "I have done nothing but in care of thee" (1.2.16), then two lines down uses the word "ignorant" to describe her. Granted, he means ignorant of their past and his true identity as the Duke of Milan, but ignorant carries another connotation for Prospero. The only other time he uses it is in conversation with Gonzalo in Act V, when he announces Ferdinand and Miranda's union: "The charm dissolves apace/And as the morning steals upon the night/Melting the darkness, so their rising senses/Begin to chase the ignorant fumes that mantle/Their clearer reason" (5.1.64-8). For characters such as Miranda and Ferdinand, "ignorant" simply means lacking in knowledge. For Prospero, ignorance means intentionally using words to conceal knowledge, whether that be through magic, lies, or merely silence. Miranda never learns of their history before Act I, probably because Prospero never deemed it a necessary part of her humanist education. Alonso's ship wrecking on the island's shores precipitates Prospero's story, which she admits "More to know/Did never meddle with my thoughts (1.2.21-2). On the other hand, ignorance meaning sheer stupidity certainly cannot be applied to either Prospero or Miranda. According to Shakespeare scholar, Marie H. Sturgiss, Miranda's entire intellect forms its own paradox:

Her alert responses to her father's story testify not only to her intelligence but also to Prospero's training. She knows something of society and of the state; she understands Prospero's story of his fall from power, and apparently comprehends the ignominy of making Milan do homage to Naples.... Though she apparently recognizes differences of sex, and seems to know something of the biology of birth, yet, on two occasions, she refers to the courtiers as "creatures", thinks Ferdinand a "spirit" when first she sees him, and persists in calling him "a thing divine". How can she be so ignorant of the very existence of humankind and yet understand the fundamental facts of contemporary society and of the body politic?

(Sturgiss 38-9)

Sturgiss' study, though now somewhat outdated, raises a point about the paradox Miranda presents in *The Tempest*; specifically her answer to the paradox of Miranda's knowledge leaves much to be desired. She acknowledges the "spontaneity of Miranda's passion" (36), but then states that Miranda uses that passion to prove herself more than just the simple daughter of a nobleman. If she is more than just the simple daughter of a nobleman, what else is she?

Miranda's ignorance of humankind justifies itself since she has interacted only with Prospero and Caliban since she was three years old. However, the knowledge of the body politic and other subjects referenced above comes from something only Prospero can give her: book knowledge. Again, while unclear how many books Prospero keeps on the island (perhaps treatises to help educate his daughter, perhaps only one volume of magic, who knows?), he possesses enough intellect from years of reading to educate her on

anything and everything he sees fit. What contact she may or may not have with books during those formational years comes directly through Prospero; this allows him to personally cultivate his interpretive community and prepare Miranda to someday govern it. Unbeknownst to Miranda, her father's initial identity as dysfunctional reader inhibits her own growth. While tutoring her, he remains dysfunctional in that he still has no complete control over Caliban. Prospero's hyper-informed reading in Milan leads to his exile, while his hyper-informed reading on the island allows him control of it and its inhabitants. Until Caliban's attempt against them both, Prospero has no reason not to assume functional reader status. Once he becomes hyper-informed on the island, Prospero uses words to shape those around him any way he wants: he molds Miranda into his heir to eventually assume control of the island, he teaches Caliban to speak and perhaps to read but their relationship still counts as a master-servant bond; and through Ariel, his magic permeates the island, spreading his bookish knowledge and thereby influencing the other characters. As we observe the interactions between father and daughter, "we remain uncertain as to where Prospero's control ends and Miranda's begins" (Sanchez 53). This leaves Miranda caught in a liminal space between functional and dysfunctional reader, unaware of her own readership status and unable to develop from it.

While Shin elaborates on the teaching methods Prospero uses on his two students, I want to make one fundamental distinction: he teaches Miranda his community's interpretive strategies, but not Caliban. Prospero and Caliban do have something of a reciprocal relationship when father and daughter first arrive. Caliban teaches Prospero about the island's natural landscape, the flora and the fauna; Prospero teaches Caliban

speech and domestic roles, but neither he nor Miranda specify what they might have taught their servant beyond that. If Miranda inherits the island, it would be in their best interests to ensure that Caliban remains as ignorant as possible. Unfortunately, Caliban's own cunning proves him a capable interpreter and he soon divines the best way to reclaim his home: either assume control over Prospero's books or of Miranda.

Miranda never comes into contact with books during the course of *The Tempest*, because all necessary book knowledge she gleans from her father. Prospero raises her on his own for twelve years, educates her, and "acts as schoolmaster to both [Caliban and Miranda]; his unorthodox educational methods, although they fail with Caliban, work well with Miranda" (Shin 373). Time and again, Miranda articulates her father-daughter relationship with Prospero, yet Prospero introduces another aspect of their relationship when he identifies himself as "thy schoolmaster" (1.2.172) and that he had "made thee more profit/Than other princes can that have more time/For vainer hours, and tutors not so careful" (1.2.172-174). In Prospero's eyes, the lessons he imparted on his daughter were more valuable than those received by other children⁴ who could then devote their leisure time to baseless activities that Miranda would not have had access to on the island. This puts Miranda's line of "More to know/Did never meddle with my thoughts" (1.2.21-22) in to sharper focus. She has certainly expressed curiosity about her past at some point prior to the play's opening scene, demonstrated in her lines, "You have often/Begun to tell me what I am, but stopped/And left me to a bootless inquisition/Concluding, 'Stay, not yet'" (1.2.33-36). If curiosity kills the cat when Don

⁴ He could mean either "princes" or "princesses," since the spelling "Princesse" in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries functioned as a common spelling for children of either gender (footnote in Arden edition of *The Tempest*).

Quixote witnesses the process of his own printed birth, Prospero ensures Miranda's safety by concealing the truth until he deems her ready to hear it. She may express said curiosity, but her deference to Prospero prevents her from actively seeking out the truth, even prevents the thought from crossing her mind. With every lesson Prospero teaches her, he molds her into his expectations of her, and she gradually becomes a reader after his own heart. She follows blindly into his interpretive community, similar to how Don Quixote persuades Sancho into his own community.

If Prospero molds her after his own image, then how does she begin to assume control over his interpretive strategies? While Caliban knows the best way to do that would be to gain the books, Miranda realizes simultaneously as her father that she does not need them to establish her own literary competence. Instead she needs human interaction. Her first step to becoming a functional reader occurs when Caliban attempts to rape her. Either she fights him off herself or Prospero intervenes in the nick of time; either way, the attempted rape allows Miranda one last lesson that Prospero cannot teach her: how to read other sentient beings. She cannot hope to learn this lesson from her book knowledge since Prospero's dysfunctional readership has never allowed his interpretive community proper contact with other communities.⁵

Shakespeare takes care to explain in detail the history behind the island's three principal inhabitants. If he wanted to explain the conflict between Prospero and Caliban, all he needed to say was the father despised the boy for trying to rape his daughter, but Shakespeare continues beyond that. One of Caliban's first lines states, "When thou cam'st first/Thou strok'st me and made much of me; wouldst give me/Water with berries

⁵ See Chapter Three, specifically how Caliban's rape attempt proves how little Prospero has grown as a reader since leaving Milan.

in't, and teach me how/To name the bigger light and how the less/That burn by day and night" (1.2.333-337). He elaborates further on his past with Prospero, but note that he received at least the beginnings of an education alongside Miranda. Prospero's decision to teach them together allows Miranda to grow into herself as his heir apparent and learn control of her body and her subjects, while also giving her an adopted brother for company. Caliban attempts the rape because he sees how Prospero molds Miranda into his image and believes he can use his sexual potency to mold her to his own purposes. The rape only reinforces what Prospero already knows: 1) that he is a poor judge of character, first with Antonio and again with Caliban, and 2) that "a successful rape would threaten his two most valuable possessions – Miranda and the island" (Shin 376).

Caliban knows the existence and location of Prospero's magical tomes; his entire plan to usurp Prospero with Stephano and Trinculo hinges on them acquiring the book(s). If Caliban wants to seize the island, he knows the best way is to appropriate the books. Without the physical books, Prospero would be nothing both corporeally and spiritually, unable to perform his magic and thus would lose his other servant Ariel. Significantly however, the paper volumes become the bait for Caliban's second plan. He only decides to act on that plan after his first one (the rape) fails and after men arrive who could help him. He recognizes that if he can control Miranda, he has a way of controlling both Prospero and his interpretive community. This would subsequently weaken Prospero permanently to dysfunctional reader status, facilitating Caliban's usurpation. By making Miranda his wife, he opens the door to "people else/This isle with Calibans" (1.2.351-352). A successful rape would have even more devastating consequences for Miranda than just being the mother to her rapist's children. Miranda, who has not yet begun her

metamorphosis to reader, would undergo a different change if Caliban had succeeded. If rape itself were not traumatizing enough, Caliban's act would erase her identity as Prospero's daughter, make her entirely his, and rewrite her so that her body would become nothing more than a walking womb. Too little too late she would gain the literary competence to read Caliban, but the act would render her unable to use it. Prospero would truly be left with nothing as even his lineage, along with his interpretive mini-dukedom community, would disappear.

The attempted rape acts as a wake-up call for both father and daughter and forces them to learn to read. Prospero still does not learn as well as he should, and remains a slightly dysfunctional reader because he continually ignores Caliban's plans. He is hyper-informed in magic and reading, but only remains a functional reader on the island because Ariel helps him check Caliban. Once safe from her aggressor, Miranda begins educating herself into a functional reader. When we first meet her, she still has not finished that education: she can read Caliban's words and intentions so she is more functional than she was, but she still follows along with Prospero's words, conveying some of his lingering dysfunctionality. Miranda realizes that reading requires knowledge of both intellect and human nature. She needs to acquire "...an understanding of the vital role that a reader's ordinary knowledge of people, places, and things plays in the practice of literary criticism" (Sights, 362), except she acquires that understanding the other way around. She begins with the practice of literary criticism, then applies it to the people around her (Prospero and Caliban), then gradually to the other characters as Alonso's company ventures closer to Prospero's cell. Apart from reciting Prospero's and Miranda's backstories, Act I Scene 2 also marks the only time Caliban and Miranda

appear onstage together. Miranda takes the opportunity to demonstrate her interpreting knowledge by berating Caliban for his actions as well. If she seems outspoken when reprimanding her father for causing the tempest (no matter how gentle the reprimand might be), her speech directed at Caliban articulates a stronger opinion than would be expected from a deferential woman. She begins:

Abhorred slave,
Which any print of goodness wilt not take,
Being capable of all ill; I pitied thee,
Took pains to make thee speak, taught thee each hour
One thing or other. When thou didst not, savage,
Know thine own meaning, but wouldst garble like
A thing most brutish, I endowed thy purposes
With words that made them known. (352-359)

Beginning with John Dryden's and William D'Avenant's 1667 adaptation of *The Tempest*, printed editions and performances of the play – for more than 200 years – attributed this speech to Prospero instead of Miranda, both for its mentions of educating Caliban and because the speech's register and tone sound more like Prospero's than hers. If we leave the speech in Miranda's voice, however, we observe her similarity to her father. She admits that she helped Caliban learn to speak – either she did so on her own or she acted as her father's teaching assistant – and learned how to interpret him literally and figuratively. When he could not discern his own meaning, she put words in his mouth. When he attempts the rape, she learns to read him in the context of his desires. In the first half of the speech, she uses one word that acts as a beacon to book people: print.

Virginia Mason Vaughan and Alden T. Vaughan, editors of the third Arden edition, explain the word “print” as to mean “imprint” and that “One of the signs of barbarism was thought to be the inability to absorb virtue as well as information” (n. line 353). Between them, Prospero and Miranda try to instill virtue in Caliban, which he does not care to learn. The rest of her speech consists of more vitriol towards him, calling him a member of a “vile race...which good natures/Could not abide to be with” (1.2.359, 360-361) and that he remains “deservedly confined into this rock/Who hadst deserved more than a prison” (362-363). Miranda never explicitly says the word “rape,” though she legitimately might not know the word exists. She subtly refers back to the act itself without stating outright that it nearly happened. Between “being capable of all ill” (354), “good natures/ Could not abide to be with,” (361) and “Deserved more than a prison” (363), she articulates more than most women would have.⁶

Miranda’s identity shifts drastically in the last third of Act I Scene 2. As we have previously observed, she continues her father’s interpretive strategies when confronted with Caliban, but the shift begins when she realizes those strategies will not apply to Ferdinand. She finishes her development and becomes the functional reader when she applies her reading knowledge to Ferdinand. When she meets him, she deviates from her father’s interpretive strategies, such as when she directly disobeys Prospero by speaking to Ferdinand, and by continuously defending him from her father’s verbal attacks.

Upon first seeing her love interest, Miranda exclaims “But tis a spirit” (1.2.412), an observation Prospero quickly corrects by stating that Ferdinand “eats and sleeps and hath

⁶ Laura Gowing explains how “the power of modesty and shame determined what both men and women said” (816), and how an air of mystery surrounding the female body gave women a type of authority over it. When placed in a feminist context, we see how Miranda’s willingness to even discuss her past situation with Caliban gives her control over her own body and aids her growth into a reader.

such senses/As we have” (413-414). From the onset, we see that Miranda’s literary competence does not extend to men. How can it if she has never seen any except her father? It extends to Caliban since she must eventually assume control of the island, but Ferdinand, displaced and lost in the island’s mystique, forces her to confront her deficiencies as reader. She calls him “divine” (419) and “noble” (420), then startles when Prospero treats Ferdinand so harshly and accuses him of usurping the title, King of Naples. She says in an aside

Why speaks my father so ungently? This
Is the third man that e’er I saw, the first
That e’er I sighed for. Pity move my father
To be inclined my way. (1.2.445-448)

Here, for the first time, we see Prospero and Miranda’s interpretive strategies come into conflict. Prospero has just remarked in his own aside how he and his daughter could easily control Ferdinand, implying that he expects her to continue following along with his community. Miranda’s lines negate any possibility of that happening. Her strategy differs from Prospero in that in Ferdinand, she reads a young, courteous man, while he reads the son of his former enemy who could follow in Alonso’s footsteps. With “Pity move my father,” she does not sit passively back and hope that Prospero shows pity, but demonstrates her willingness to challenge his interpretive community with her own.

This conflict continues when Prospero calls Ferdinand a traitor and charms him to keep him from moving. Miranda clings to Prospero’s robe, “hang not on my garments” (475) and begs for mercy on her new beloved, claiming that “I’ll be his surety” (476). Even though Prospero has no real intention of harming Ferdinand and manipulates the

situation so their courting will not prove too easy, he does remark that to her, “there is no more such shapes as he/Having seen but him and Caliban” (479-480). When he tells her that in Italy, Ferdinand also could be regarded as a Caliban, she realizes that her literary competence does not extend to men beyond her father and Caliban, a competence she achieved through her access to books, Prospero’s teachings, and Caliban’s aggression. If we return to Sturgiss’s paradox (Miranda’s ignorance of humankind but simultaneous understanding of societal structure), we finally see how the paradox functions. She retains her book knowledge, which would allow her to govern the island and remain the daughter of a book, but once she encounters a world apart from the island, she realizes just how lacking her own education is.

As stated in the previous chapter, Prospero realizes that to live in the real world, he must combine his bookish intellect with his comprehension of human behavior to become a reader that can function off the island. Whether or not he can do so without Ariel and his “art” is a debatable point. Since Miranda does not utilize her father’s magical tomes, she does not face the same dilemma. Her book knowledge exists in her memory, making her less reliant on the books than her father is,⁷ and through her interactions with Ferdinand, she gains the social competence needed to navigate her “brave new world” (5.1.183).

When Miranda and Ferdinand reappear in Act III Scene 1, Miranda directly disobeys her father by speaking to Ferdinand even after Prospero has warned her not to. However,

⁷ We need remember also that Don Quixote sheds his own reliance on his books when he leaves for his first sally in Part I. Whether he has the books or not, his memory retains all the particulars of their stories, which allows him to cultivate his literary competence apart from them. His interpretive community conflicts with others; when he loses, he claims that an enchanter works against him, and when someone else argues with him, he accuses them of not being *cursado* or versed in chivalric romance.

she knows she has some time to speak since Prospero “Is hard at study; pray now, rest yourself/He’s safe for these three hours” (3.1.20-21), not knowing that Prospero watches them as they speak. This does demonstrate her knowledge of her father’s routine: she knows he should be studying, and that allows her time to develop her new community and new identity beyond the daughter of a book. She can only develop that community by speaking with Ferdinand. When he asks her name, she answers, “Miranda. – O my father/I have broke your hest to say so!” (3.1.36-37), implying again the conflict between Prospero’s community and hers. By saying so, she acknowledges that her community exists independently of his, even though a part of her still clings to the strategies to which she is accustomed.

Hers and Ferdinand’s conversation alerts her again to the fact that other women exist besides her, when he states that “Have I liked several women; never any/With so full soul but some defect in her/Did quarrel with the noblest grace she owed” (3.1.43-45). Ferdinand’s own status as functional reader falls to the wayside as he begins to tilt towards her community. He claims that he cannot see any defect in Miranda whatsoever and that her beauty and virtues far surpass those of the women he previously admired. She sees the defect though and admits it, “How features are abroad/I am skillless of” (3.1.52-53), but she knows that if she wants to gain that skill, she must prepare to face other men and women. She admits her lack of experience not just with other people, but as a reader. In order to keep Ferdinand’s attention, she must nurture her interpretive community and enfold him into it, much the same way Don Quixote persuades Sancho Panza into his. In so doing, she becomes the new Prospero, head of her community, still the daughter of a book but with new interpretive strategies that allow her to combine her

different competencies. She actively employs the new strategy when she asks Ferdinand plainly, “Do you love me?” (3.1.67), and his answer shows how easily persuaded he is:

O heaven, O earth, bear witness to this sound,
And crown what I profess with kind event
If I speak true; if hollowly, invert/
What best is boded me to mischief! I,
Beyond all limit of what else i'th' world,
Do love, prize, honour you. (3.1.68-73)

He welcomes misfortune should he ever speak lies to her and swears his allegiance only to her, renouncing any previous interpretive communities and functioning completely within hers. If there were any lingering doubts about his willingness to join her community, Miranda's marriage proposal erases them, “I am your wife, if you will marry me” (3.1.83) and he replies “Ay, with a heart as willing/As bondage e'er of freedom” (3.1.88-89). In choosing to humble himself in such a way before her, he puts aside his own interpretive strategies in favor of hers. Her lessons in rhetoric from Prospero enable her to convince Ferdinand to join her community, and his acquiescence proves her strategies work. From this point onward, Miranda leads her own interpretive community, capable of functioning both on and off the island, and of engaging with other communities without conflict.

After Alonso and his party reach Prospero's cell, they observe Ferdinand and Miranda playing chess, and they hear her accuse him of cheating. He denies it and her response, “Yes, for a score of kingdoms you should wrangle/And I would call it fair play” (5.1.174-175), teases him with his own submission. She hints at the inferiority of her own literary

competence when, by now, hers far surpasses his. She subtly informs him that “she will not let herself be manipulated by her new husband any more than she will by her father” (Sights 371). Prospero’s earlier prediction has come true: Miranda’s type of reading assumes control over Ferdinand’s, which grants her and her father safe passage off the island.

Miranda combines two types of knowledge: book knowledge she gains from Prospero and social competence she gains from Ferdinand. She needs both to survive in Milan, as does Prospero. As she educates herself to become a functional reader, she simultaneously educates Prospero. She absorbs other people into her narrative, learns how to make them conform to her strategy, all while her father silently observes. Therefore when she meets Ferdinand, she quickly uses her knowledge of Caliban to learn how to read her husband-to-be (once she overcomes her wonder at seeing another man on the island). She completes her self-education when she successfully applies her reading knowledge to those around her. Her betrothal serves as the third and final catalyst for Prospero’s own transition back to functional readership. He knows that if he wishes to reclaim his dukedom, he must abjure his magic and his community; observing her completes his education. When Alonso’s party arrives at the former duke’s cell, Prospero confronts Antonio and Sebastian with only, “But you, my brace of lords, were I so minded/I here could pluck his highness’ frown upon you/And justify you traitors!” (5.1.126-128). He states clearly that he could reveal their plan to murder Alonso, but instead he says, “At this time I will tell no tales” (5.1.129), demonstrating his own inclusion into Miranda’s interpretive community. He learns forgiveness and how to carry social competence back with him to Milan. Though still not Prospero’s equal in terms of loquaciousness, the pupil

surpasses the teacher in a different way. She knows how to read effectively on her own, while he must learn to do so without his “art” and without Ariel’s aid.

Books and Readers in *Titus Andronicus*

Miranda remains an obvious female character to associate with books, since Prospero’s library forms the backdrop of *The Tempest*. Even if the books do not appear onstage, the audience can still sense their presence and their role in Miranda’s and Prospero’s educations as functional readers. What happens if we examine another play in which women have access, whether direct or indirect, to a library? Interestingly enough, one of Shakespeare’s earlier tragedies, *Titus Andronicus*, is the only other play in which a character actually says the word “library.” The titular character himself invites his daughter, Lavinia, into his private chamber to peruse his books together, both as a leisure activity and to read away their sorrows. Besides her direct access to books, Lavinia has one other characteristic in common with Miranda: her identity as rape victim except this time, the rape succeeds. Lavinia must use book knowledge to assume leadership of her familial interpretive community and educate her father similar to how Miranda educates Prospero, only under more dire circumstances.

Scholars and audiences generally agree that *Titus Andronicus* is Shakespeare’s bloodiest and most gruesome work, and true, no other play carries the same quantity of violence.⁸ With each new scene, the characters detail onstage the violent acts they commit offstage, beginning when the titular character kills Alarbus - eldest son of the Gothic Queen, Tamora - as retribution for his sons who were killed during the ten-year-

⁸ Clark Hulse calculates “14 killings, 9 of them onstage, 6 severed members, 1 rape (or 2 or 3, depending on how you count), 1 live burial, 1 case of insanity, and 1 of cannibalism – an average of 5.2 atrocities per act, or one for every 97 lines” (106) within the play’s overall structure, and William Weber notes that “Shakespeare’s first tragedy contains as much gruesomeness as the rest of his plays combined” (698).

war between the Romans and Goths. This ignites one revenge killing after another, culminating in the scene when Chiron and Demetrius – Tamora’s two remaining sons – avenge their brother by violating Titus’s daughter, Lavinia. They force her to watch as they murder her fiancé, Bassianus, then they drag her into the woods and rape her. Mimicking the Philomela story from Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, they cut out her tongue then take the mutilation a step further and cut off her hands. Her redemption comes two acts later, when she acquires her nephew’s copy of Ovid, and clumsily flips to the page narrating Philomela’s rape. Just as a narrative tapestry allows Philomela to communicate, so does Philomela’s story, told through a specific book, allow Lavinia to regain her stolen agency. While many critics have examined the relation between Lavinia and Philomela, not as many have examined the act of reading in itself. William W. Weber suggests that Shakespeare uses Ovid to perpetuate a cycle of revenge; Bethany Packard names Lavinia as coauthor of the play, her reference to *The Metamorphoses* demonstrating her own creative process; and Lisa Starkes-Estes comments on how Shakespeare “remakes Virgil’s epic poem into a savage Ovidian revenge play in *Titus Andronicus*...and a revisionary Ovidian tragedy in *Antony and Cleopatra*” (84).

At first glance, we may not see Lavinia as any type of reader. For one thing, her association with books does not present itself until the beginning of Act IV; for another thing, before her rape, Lavinia has no reason whatsoever to operate as a reader, functional or otherwise. She belongs to an interpretive community consisting entirely of men, men who speak for her even when she still possesses a voice. Her father, Titus, arranges her marriage to the emperor, Saturninus, before her eyes; her fiancé, Bassianus, asserts his previous claim for her hand, and her brother demonstrates his support for Bassianus. She

only has the power of speech for a short time prior to her rape, but does not often use it; she uses it eloquently but not often nor persuasively. After Bassianus escorts her offstage, she does not speak again for the rest of Act I, but instead allows Bassianus and Saturninus to speak about her as though she were absent. She presents herself in Act I as a dysfunctional reader simply because she cannot function outside of a community where men control her voice. When she eventually speaks, it gets her into trouble.

Lavinia only reappears after the conflict has momentarily settled, but her next words reignite it. She and Bassianus mock Tamora, who has just married Saturninus, implying that they know of her affair with the moor Aaron, "'Tis thought you have a goodly gift in horning" (2.3.67) and "Jove shield your husband from his hounds today/'Tis pity they should take him for a stag" (70-1), a line that potentially references the story of Actaeon in *The Metamorphoses*.⁹ While Bassianus makes subtle jabs at Tamora's fidelity, Lavinia cuts straight to the chase, speaks the two above lines, and openly accuses Tamora of cuckolding her husband. In this scene, we again see two interpretive communities enter into conflict: the first consists of Bassianus and Lavinia, who interpret Tamora as a conquered woman and now harmless Roman wife, and the second consists of Tamora and her sons, whose plan hinges on the other woman's inability to read. Lavinia's own incapacity to control her tongue, coupled with Tamora's desire for revenge and her sons' desire for Lavinia, lead directly to her downfall; her status as dysfunctional reader does

⁹ This story's protagonist also is robbed of the ability to speak, this time by a vengeful goddess. Ovid describes how Actaeon accidentally finds the chaste goddess of the hunt, Diana, bathing with help from her nymphs. When she sees him, she splashes water upon him in a fit of embarrassed fury and turns him into a stag. Eventually, his own dogs track him and kill him. Lavinia knows the story well enough to know Actaeon's fate, both by his dogs and his inability to defend himself with speech. Actaeon's body dematerializes and he literally and figuratively ceases to be human (figuratively in that he no longer has the agency speech afforded him). Lavinia hints that the same thing will happen to Saturninus if Tamora continues to cuckold him; she does not anticipate a similar dematerialization when Chiron and Demetrius dismember her.

not help. According to Hur, Tamora and Aaron become “strangers who threaten destruction of the long-descended Andronici as well as of the Emperor and his brother” (139), yet Lavinia mocks them anyway. Tamora’s response is to deny Lavinia mercy before she’s raped, “I will not hear her speak; away with her!” (2.2.137). Lavinia gives an impassioned defense, begs Chiron to speak on her behalf, “Do thou entreat her show a woman’s pity” (2.2.147), but her words fall on three sets of deaf ears. Lavinia only realizes her mistake and her identity as dysfunctional reader after her fiancé’s death, immediately before the rape occurs. When she realizes what is about to happen, she pleads with Tamora by indirectly referring to the forthcoming violation:

‘Tis present death I beg, and one thing more

That womanhood denies my tongue to tell:

Oh, keep me from their worse-than-killing lust,

And tumble me into some loathsome pit

Where never man’s eye may behold my body.

Do this, and be a charitable murderer. (2.2.173-178)

Even conscious of it coming, Lavinia cannot bring herself to say the word “rape.”¹⁰ Her virtue and obeisance to her father prohibit her from articulating that which she fears, and she loses the ability to speak even before her rapists’ have completed the deed. The rape occurs offstage in the gap between this scene and the following one, and when Act II Scene 3 opens, Lavinia enters mute and crying and encounters her uncle.

¹⁰ By the time the play was written c.1590, the word “rape” meaning to violate another person had been standard in the English vernacular for approximately 170 years. She hears Saturninus and Bassianus use it onstage with a slightly different meaning (simply forcibly removed, not necessarily sexually assaulted), so she certainly knows of the word’s existence, but chooses not to use it herself.

Her interactions with Marcus and Titus sharply juxtapose how two varying communities differ so drastically in their readings. When Marcus finds her, he observes her severed hands and tongue, but believes that to be the extent of the damage. He sees the mutilation, not the violation. As he delivers the scene's closing monologue, he asks her, "Shall I speak for thee? Shall I say 'tis so?" (2.4.33). Marcus becomes yet another in a line of men who speak for her, but this time, she cannot correct him when he inevitably jumps to the wrong conclusion. The entire play comments on the spoken word, but Acts II and III examine:

...the chasm between the spoken word and the actual fact, an investigation, incidentally, whose meaning is fully experienced only when Lavinia appears before us raped and bleeding...Far from being used inadvertently then, the language self-consciously focuses upon itself so as to demonstrate the manner in which figurative speech can diminish and even transform the actual horror of events. (Tricomi 228)

Marcus carries the action of Act II Scene 3, reciting a 47-line monologue that alters the narrative from the correct one, though he remains unaware of this. He references the Ovid story, saying "Fair Philomela, why she but lost her tongue/And in a tedious sampler sewed her mind/But lovely niece, that mean is cut from thee" (38-40). He acknowledges that were she still in possession of her hands, she could have woven a tapestry finer than the one Philomela gives to Procne, but he forgets what Tereus does to Philomela besides sever her tongue. He almost guesses Lavinia's plight, but does not actually state it. Whether or not his request to speak for her and incorrectly guess her predicament bothers her is an interpretation left up to the actor playing Lavinia. When it certainly bothers her

is at the beginning of Act III, first when her father fails to recognize her, and second when she hears that two of her brothers have been arrested for Bassianus's murder. Her father, her uncle, and the rest of her male family all attempt to place various readings into her mouth, all of which are wrong. Once robbed of her speech, Lavinia becomes her own interpretive community, but still a dysfunctional one since any and all interaction with other communities results in mistaken readings. Either she must find a way to communicate or watch her family dissolve further into chaos.

When Act III opens, Lavinia possesses enough awareness of reality to know that she must educate Titus and Marcus in functional reading, but as of yet, she has no means to do so. As well as a new self-awareness, her silence alerts her to Titus and Marcus's positions as dysfunctional readers. Neither of them has any means to grow either, but whereas Prospero works towards his growth after Caliban's attempt on Miranda, Titus and Marcus remain ignorant of any potential growth still to take place. The problem of readership presents another problem in itself, because no one considers her a person any longer. Alexander Leggatt remarks that, "they [Chiron and Demetrius] tell her to do things – normal things – she can no longer do: tell who attacked her, write, call for water, wash her hands. In depriving her of language, they have deprived her of human contact and normal life, taking not just her chastity and her speech but her humanity" (17). The men's community fails at deciphering her, purely because they cannot fathom exactly what they are meant to be reading. Is she a person or a text or something else entirely inhuman?¹¹ This becomes painfully obvious to her when Marcus does not recognize her, and neither at first does her father. When Marcus brings her before Titus, he introduces

¹¹ I plan to develop this question in a later article on materializing female bodies into books, see above notes 3 and 8.

her by saying “This *was* thy daughter” (3.1.63, my emphasis). Marcus takes it upon himself to speak for her, narrating how he found her in the forest, while Titus tries (and fails miserably) to read his daughter’s facial expressions. Only when Titus mentions that two of her remaining three brothers have been arrested for Bassianus’s murder does she begin to give him a sign to read.

TITUS: Look, Marcus! Ah, son Lucius, look on her!

When I did name her brothers, then fresh tears

Stood on her cheeks, as doth the honeydew

Upon a gathered lily almost withered.

MARCUS: Perchance she weeps because they killed her husband;

Perchance because she knows them innocent. (3.1.110-115)

Either explanation could be right; either explanation could be wrong. The men know this and so does Lavinia. Unless she finds a way to correct their ambiguous thoughts, the plot comes to a screeching halt, thereby implying that with the rape, Chiron and Demetrius stole not only her personal agency but also her narrative agency. If she cannot speak, presumably she cannot function neither within her interpretive community nor her own story. Neither can Titus and Marcus. All of them would thus end their narratives as dysfunctional readers, with the men constantly in search of the correct meaning, and Lavinia unable to begin their education. Speech leads to action, and in this case, “Direct speech loses purpose and meaning, highlighting the uselessness of traditional discourse in the face of devastation and psychologically mirroring the physical mutilation of Lavinia” (Weber 710). By the end of Act III, Lavinia knows that if action is to recommence, then

she has to find an alternative, non-traditional discourse, and likely her father gives her idea in the act's closing lines when he invites her into his library.

Lavinia realizes that she needs an outside stimulus to restart and correct the reading process, otherwise Titus and Marcus will continue to misread her. She must acquire a preface. Robert Miola remarks on a certain rigidity when it came to England's printed word: "Moreover, a didactic impulse, political and moral, strongly conditions editing, writing, and reading in the period. Sermons, homilies, and devotional literature comprise a substantial proportion of Elizabethan publication. Many literary and historical texts appear with polemical prefaces and notes to protect against misinterpretation and guide the reader in profitable instruction" (10-11). Neither a printed book nor a manuscript necessarily conveyed the author's intentions upon writing,¹² but England's sixteenth and seventeenth-century prefaces surfaced for the purpose of clarifying that intention. Miola continues with, "In the hands of Renaissance commentators even a bright and lively scene from comedy, from Plautus or Terence, illustrates any number of rhetorical devices and moral lessons...Even if resisted, the sheer bulk and existence of such commentary lent a seriousness to the act of reading and fostered sensitivity to moral issues" (11). The phrase "seriousness to the act of reading" becomes crucial in interpreting Titus and Lavinia as both characters and readers. Titus closes Act III by telling his daughter, "Lavinia, go with me/I'll to thy closet and go read with thee/Sad stories chanced in the times of old" (3.2.82-84). Titus, it seems, considers reading nothing more than a leisure activity meant to while away the hours. He offers to sit with her in her private chamber and read sad stories of years past, or in looser terms he intends to drown his sorrows in

¹² See the chapter on Don Quixote's Printed Identity.

fiction. The different interpretive communities again come into conflict: Titus believes he can read to while away the hours, while Lavinia sees the deeper implication behind reading. She knows that if he would correctly read her, he would deduce the truth, but he either has no interest in reading her or no idea that he even should. In this moment, she recognizes her father as a dysfunctional reader whose community operates not from hyper-informed reading but from no reading at all. She also recognized Marcus as such when he did not recognize her.

By now, Lavinia has realized that she belongs to an interpretive community with an ineffective reading strategy. In order to teach them to read, Lavinia must acquire her own polemical preface, but time works against her. She knows she cannot afford to have her father and uncle waste time squabbling over what might be true, proved when Saturninus orders her brothers' execution after yet more manipulation from Tamora and Aaron, and even more mutilation as Titus (uselessly) severs his own hand to save his sons. Therefore, when she sees Young Lucius – her nephew – with his schoolbooks, one catches her eye and she chases after him to acquire it, causing him to panic and think her mad. He says,

My lord, I know not, nor can I guess,

Unless some fit or frenzy do possess her:

For I have heard my grandsire say full oft,

Extremity of griefs would make me mad;

And I have read that Hecuba of Troy

Ran mad through sorrow: that made me to fear; (4.1.16-21)

He drops his books, which allows Lavinia to stop the chase and claim the book she wants, a school copy of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. When the boy answers Marcus's question as to

what book Lavinia wants, he inadvertently reveals the truth behind the family's functional interpretive community: it consists entirely of women. The boy explains that his mother – Lavinia's sister-in-law, presumably deceased – gave him the book and Marcus replies, "For love of her that's gone/Perhaps she culled it from among the rest" (4.1.43-44). Which "she" does Marcus refer to, the child's mother or Lavinia? If he means Lavinia, then he reiterates what Titus says four lines above when he asks what book Lavinia fusses over, but if he means the mother, then he implies an interpretive community outside of the narrative, one comprised of women. The women know how to correctly handle the books, the men do not. Reading a book implies passive reading, exactly what Titus does when he and Lavinia read together offstage and what Cervantes perhaps sarcastically references in the prologue to *Don Quixote* Part I when he addresses his audience as "desocupado lector" or "idle reader." Likewise, Young Lucius attempts to read her like a book when he deems her mad, and she quickly puts a stop to it by choosing the book. Reading a text implies action and agency, and when she acquires the book, she also reclaims her stolen agency. She may no longer be a daughter, a niece or a human, but she is an active, functional reader who now has complete control of her family's community, an identity sufficient to restart the plot.

She clumsily turns the pages until she finds the story she wants: the sisters Procne and Philomela, the latter of whom is raped by her brother-in-law. Up until this point, Titus and Marcus only see the mutilation on her hands, but have no knowledge of the rape; the one time Marcus guesses that it might have happened, he hurriedly rejects the theory in favor of another one, demonstrating perhaps a fear of reading Lavinia correctly and preventing a correct encounter between two interpretive communities. Both Weber and

Leggatt remark how Marcus eroticizes his niece in his monologue, but intentionally stops reading her when he compares her to Philomela. He demonstrates a fear of both her missing voice and what that voice might imply and from that point onward continuously misreads her. She stops those misinterpretations when she finds the Philomela story in the book. This demonstrates at least some prior familiarity with *that* book, whether it be *The Metamorphoses* in general or that particular edition; she knows what story she is looking for, and either she knows exactly the page or will recognize it when she sees it. Either way, she possesses a knowledge of the book that the rest of her family does not, and with it she finally begins educating her father and uncle to become functional readers.

The book becomes Lavinia's new interpretive strategy, one she could not attain without her access to a library nor without literary competence towards the book and the people around her. She absorbs the book into her sense of self and her narrative, superimposes Philomela's story onto her own, and uses the book as a go-between so that her father and uncle might use it to read her. She declares herself as such by turning to the page detailing Philomela's story, and thereby turns the physical book into her own polemical preface.¹³ She gestures to the page until Titus gets the message, reads it, and deduces that a rape actually occurred. Marcus follows her lead and demonstrates with his feet and mouth how she may use his staff to write the names of her attackers in the dirt. She does so and the story finally reveals itself to the men; the text has told its story and

¹³ Miola notes that printed books often carried these prefaces and does not make commentary on manuscript books as such. This might again raise the question on if higher credibility should be placed in print or manuscript books, but in this case, the answer might be print simply because she becomes a book with a preface. Whether her nephew's book is manuscript or print is irrelevant, it can still convey the Philomela story and when she incorporates it into her identity, both she and it become printed material. This contradicts concerns among sixteenth and seventeenth-century book commentators on the expanding reading public, who believed the written word might corrupt female readers (Malfatti 91). Rather than corrupt her, the written word asserts Lavinia's narrative presence.

the girl takes advantage of her regained agency. Acquiring Young Lucius's *Metamorphoses* constitutes a new type of reading strategy, one that allows Lavinia to become the center of her family's interpretive community, one in which she exhibits her capacity to educate others about her strategy, and one in which Titus and Marcus finally become functional readers themselves. All of this together allows Titus to enact the revenge he craves. From then on, the play follows the format of a revenge tragedy: Titus fools Tamora into believing he is mad, cuts Chiron and Demetrius' throats, then feeds them to their own mother in yet another imitation of Ovid.

If we apply the reader theory to the entire play, this raises new interpretative possibilities of each of the characters, beyond the straightforward intertextuality between Lavinia and Philomela. Lavinia uses language eloquently (albeit ineffectively) in the first two acts before Tamora and her sons rob her of it. She then educates herself and Titus on functional reading so they may have their revenge. In trying to destroy the potential for agency via speech and writing, the tongue and the hands, Chiron and Demetrius still fail to destroy the words themselves. With the book as her means of expressing words, Lavinia rebuilds her family's interpretive community and the moment Titus and Marcus deduce the truth, they also become functional readers.

In conclusion, Miranda and Lavinia reshape their respective family's interpretive communities, Miranda because she absorbs Ferdinand into her own reading style, educates her father in functional reading as well, and leaves the island with a new identity separate from "daughter of a book;" and Lavinia because she needs the men around her to read her correctly so they may enact revenge on the correct aggressors. None of the aggressors realize that even if they remove one piece of her identity, the woman can still

rewrite herself and teach others to read her; likewise they fail to remove the women's identities as readers because only the reader him or herself can renounce that identity. However, these two women not only maintain their identities but grow into functional readers because they possess a combination of book knowledge and social knowledge (and, in Miranda's case, natural island knowledge), generated by self-awareness and education. Lavinia finds a new way to speak and though she ultimately dies by her father's hand, her change allows her to function as a sentient being until Titus can act upon his lust for revenge. Likewise, Miranda "actively chooses to be Ferdinand's wife so that she may play an active role in her own self-definition" (Slights 374). Titus and Prospero achieve revenge for their daughters in the end, the one in true Ovidian fashion and the other simply by leaving Caliban on the island alone without any chance to reproduce. More than that, the reader-women create their own interpretive communities, which enable their fathers to develop by teaching them to read, something the men could not have done by themselves. Ultimately, Miranda and Lavinia prove that reading is the best revenge.

CONCLUSION

Shakespeare and Cervantes both develop characters that somehow function as readers. Each belongs to an interpretive community, whether it be the solitary ones of Don Quixote or Prospero, any number of communities that pervade both volumes of the *Quixote*, or Miranda's and Lavinia's rewriting of their own family's communities. Each character is either the functional or the dysfunctional reader: Prospero and Don Quixote act as dysfunctional readers in that they cannot operate properly within their particular societies (Milan and La Mancha respectively), due to hyper-informed readings of their preferred texts. Don Quixote embodies chivalric romance, while Prospero exemplifies studies of liberal arts and magic. Their communities function only within themselves; Don Quixote's community expects others to conform to his chivalric utopia, while Prospero governs effectively on an island ruled by magic. They transition back to functional readers when something else catalyzes the conversion: the printing press for Don Quixote and Miranda's marriage for Prospero. When they become functional readers, they renounce their communities and the books that created them. Don Quixote sheds his skin, reclaims his identity as Alonso Quijano, and about his books says, "I perceive my folly, and the peril into which reading them brought me; now, by God's mercy, in my right senses, I loathe them" (826). The books only bring him into peril because he forgets how to distinguish between reality and appearance; while as Quijano in

Part I, he cannot grasp the one concept that would make him a functional reader – the literary fictionality of the book – and the self-contained community between him and Sancho does not think to grasp that concept. He can only do so after he returns home at the end of Part II, once a new set of hyper-informed communities demonstrate fictionality for him.

Prospero's behavior unfolds in a similar way to Quijano's as he sequesters himself in his study and surrounds himself with books that teach what presumably would amount to a humanist education, with some magic added for good measure. His decision to delegate his responsibilities to Antonio demonstrates his self-presentation as a dysfunctional reader, and his actions on the island signal his willing transition back to the functional one. He uses a mixture of books and practical knowledge (his magic) to govern his mini-dukedom, and with Ariel's help, he keeps order, manipulates events to his will, and leaves the island prepared to carry his experience back to Milan. Throughout all this, Miranda serves as the catalyst that jumpstarts his return to functional readership. Miranda begins the play imitating her father's reading style (shown by her interactions with Caliban), but then assumes control of her family's interpretive community when she meets Ferdinand; he allows her to break away from Prospero's imposing interpretations and become a functional reader in her own right. Likewise, Lavinia only becomes a functional reader when Chiron and Demetrius rape her, after which she becomes educator of her family's interpretive community and guides her father and uncle to become readers. Both women educate their respective male family in how to read, guiding the men to Powers's growing awareness. All of these characters form their interpretive communities around their access to books and libraries, and all realize that to live in

reality, they must possess a combination of literary and social competence. The only question that remains is what other interpretive communities can we add to our discussion of functional, dysfunctional, and hyper-informed readers?

What if we considered Shakespeare and Cervantes themselves as interacting interpretive communities? How does our reading of one influence our reading of the other? Using the idea of intertextuality, we may understand how both authors concurrently wrote characters as (dys)functional readers, even if one may not necessarily have possessed reading knowledge of the other. Susan Bassnett defines intertextuality as “the idea that texts exist in an endlessly interwoven relationship with one another” (138), a concept she uses to form connections between two seemingly unrelated or conflicting plotlines, characters, or authors. Forming such a connection presents its own problems. A student encounters an impediment simply because “the basis of such comparative study was the idea that there existed, in some demonstrable way, a direct link between writers, which presupposed incontrovertible evidence and the trustworthiness of writers to acknowledge their sources” (137). In other words, trying to prove a direct connection between two writers required searching for evidence either lost or that never existed in the first place. Instead of a direct cause-and-effect, Bassnett describes intertextuality as more of a circular web that consists of one or more references to a secondary text within a primary text (e.g. the continued references to other chivalric novels in *Don Quixote* or to Philomela in *Titus Andronicus*). Reading the secondary text alters, reconstructs, or destabilizes a previous interpretation of the primary one and vice versa.

This dissertation contains four primary texts (five if we include Avellaneda’s sequel as well) – *Don Quixote* Parts I and II, *Titus Andronicus*, and *The Tempest* – and the

secondary text with which each interacts is the book. Sometimes they interact with just the book (Don Quixote's new identity as dysfunctional reader), sometimes with the text within it (Alonso Quijano and his friends), and sometimes both (Lavinia). By examining each primary source within the context of the book, we have observed how the protagonists function as readers when confronted with book and text, and when their interpretive communities engage with each other. However, if we turn that intertextuality on the authors themselves, what type of reading occurs? In other words, what does a Cervantine reading of Shakespeare look like, and what does a Shakespearean reading of Cervantes look like?

A Cervantine reading of Shakespeare allows us to search for the books. From the moment the reader begins *Don Quixote*, they cannot escape the overwhelming presence of books. The prologue describes its own novel's fictional genesis, the first chapter foregrounds Alonso Quijano's library, and characters often come into contact with some form of written material, whether that be a printed book or a scrap of paper on which someone has handwritten a poem. In Shakespeare's works, the books are not quite so overt, even when present onstage. A character might be asked to swear an oath on a book or might read excerpts out loud, but where are the instances in which written material advances the plot as strongly as it does in *Don Quixote*? The two most prominent plays are the only two in which libraries are featured in the narratives. In *The Tempest*, the audience senses the presence of the books, hiding just out of sight and quietly influencing the plot, their physical stage presence rendered unnecessary, just as the physical presence of Don Quixote's books is no longer necessary as he departs for his second sally. Alonso's arrival and Miranda's betrothal allow Prospero to reevaluate his position on the

island, in turn comparing the island to Milan. His books made him a functional reader on the island, but a dysfunctional one in Milan, so in order to return to Milanese society, he sheds his skin in a similar to manner to Don Quixote; he renounces both his books and his identity as hyper-informed reader and chooses to live as the Duke of Milan. In *Titus Andronicus*, a book does not physically appear onstage until the opening lines of Act IV, but that book enables the action to restart, and the revenge tragedy to occur. Lavinia educates her father on the difference between books as pleasure objects and book as tools of communication. Before she acquires the book, it still quietly advances the plot, since characters reference Philomela's story time and again in another intertextual move. Lavinia needs only to acquire a copy of *The Metamorphoses* to promote a correct reading.

If Cervantes makes us search for Shakespeare's books, then what do we search for when we move in the opposite direction and attempt a Shakespearean reading of Cervantes? Shakespeare uses the word "read" more readily and fluidly than he uses "book." While the Bard certainly references reading specific written artifacts, his characters more often and openly read each other than they do a paper or a book. Hamlet, Othello, Romeo, and a plethora of other characters function as readers of each other.¹ Conflict arises when the interpretive communities clash with each other, and misinterpretations abound. In the comedies, those misinterpretations ultimately get resolved and usually end in a marriage (Claudio allows Don John in *Much Ado About*

¹ A separate book could (and has) been written on examples in which these characters (mis)read other characters within their respective dramas. In *Reading Shakespeare's Characters*, Christy Desmet combines classical and contemporary rhetoric to analyze how the protagonists of dramas such as *Cymbeline*, *Measure for Measure*, *King Lear*, and *The Winter's Tale* (among others) use rhetoric to shape themselves and shape how others might read them. While she selects a diverse range of comedies and tragedies, she does not utilize either of the plays that form part of the central focus of this dissertation.

Nothing to influence how he reads his bride-to-be, and only learns to read properly when he believes her dead), whereas in the tragedies, they complement the tragic hero's flaw and aid in his downfall (Hamlet's constantly changing readings of Claudius and the ghost of Old Hamlet increase his indecisiveness, which results in mass carnage in Elsinore). A Shakespearean reading of Cervantes, then, makes us search for the readers and their interactions amongst each other. While I limit this dissertation to characters whose readings of each other derive from their contact with books, I also understand how further study could be made on characters' readings of other characters. As Part I progresses, Don Quixote's and Sancho's community interacts with those readers who have enough previous contact with chivalric novels to effectively parody them (such as Dorotea in Chapter 29, who agrees to play a damsel-in-distress in order to help the barber and the curate bring Don Quixote home), and those readers possessing less knowledge of chivalric novels and who interact with Don Quixote as a person (the shepherds he meets before Grisóstomo's funeral, one of whom considers a knight's devotion to his lady a type of paganism). The latter may interact with Don Quixote the dysfunctional reader, but they still interact with the man. These readers appear more frequently in Part I, because in Part II, all readers attempt to mold Don Quixote into their expectations of him after reading Part I. Whether a book aids the interpretation or not, Shakespeare urges us to question what types of readers Cervantes places at different moments in his work.

This intertextual discussion encompasses my reasons for comparing Cervantes and Shakespeare. Where do we find the books? Where do we find the readers? How do these readers perceive reality according to the strategies employed by their respective interpretive communities? Most importantly, what might this tell us about readers today?

How the reader perceives what is or is not real depends on the material with which they engage, but any type of material would suit the purpose. Printed, handwritten, or spoken material would shape the Early Modern reality; reality today largely consists of things communicated via traditional media or, increasingly, through social media, the latter of which also functions as a textual database that reaches a still broader audience.² In both instances, conversation and debate further shape textual interpretations and allow other perspectives to influence the reader's own. The text shapes the reading experience and the sum of all experiences still today comprises a person's reality. Powers continues to explain how *Don Quixote* functions as such a book, one that thrives on "the problem of reality" (289). However, since no two readers read in exactly the same way, no two interpretations will be the same and, as such, no one will view the problem of reality in the same way. Is Don Quixote mad or not? Three different readers are likely to give three distinct answers, depending on how they read his character, his actions, and the reactions of those who meet him. All of them could and would technically be correct. The reading experience allows both the reading character and the outside reader holding the book to grow in a way they otherwise could not. Therefore, any and every reader simultaneously functions as a text and constantly changes as the dialogue changes. Stanley Fish makes a similar move in the preface to *Is There a Text in this Class?* when he says:

There isn't a text in this or any other class if one means by text what E.D.

Hirsch and others mean by it, "an entity which always remains the same

from one moment to the next" (*Validity in Interpretation*, p.46); but there

² Contemporary anxieties caused by social media, such as the distinction between real and "fake news," parallel Don Quixote's own anxiety when confronted with Avellaneda's text, which in itself constitutes "fake news."

is a text in this and every other class if one means by text the structure of meanings that is obvious and inescapable from the perspective of whatever interpretive communities happen to be in force. (vii)

In this regard, any book – physical or digital – and any person functions as a text, since each expresses its capability to generate new meanings depending on interpretive strategies. Interpretive communities still exist now as they did at the turn of the seventeenth century, but they have exploded in ways that could not have been anticipated before the rise of social media.

We need remember also that the readers engaging with Don Quixote and Prospero's communities include us as well. Cervantes uses Part I's prologue to deliberately engage with his outside reader, granting his blessing to whatever interpretations our respective strategies might lead us to: "you can say what you will about the story without fear of being abused for any ill or rewarded for any good you may say of it" (9). Shakespeare writes an epilogue in Prospero's voice in which the character beseeches us "But release me from my bands/With the help of your good hands...As you from crimes would pardoned be/Let your indulgence set me free" (9-10, 19-20). Specifically he asks for applause, but implicitly he asks us to release him from his community and allow his return to Milan. Even more implicitly, Shakespeare asks that we express our appreciation for his work. In both instances, the authors speak to us directly and employ rhetoric that stimulates conversation between them and us. The conversation has continued for more than 400 years.

Bassnett sets a goal to bridge the gap between academic disciplines specifically English and Italian literatures. In this dissertation, I have attempted to bridge the gap

between two of the great masters of Early Modern literature, using reader-response criticism. When one author functions as the primary text, we rethink our interpretations of the other as the secondary text. Unfortunately, the one text that almost certainly would progress a comparative reading between both authors is now lost to us. In the years before his death, Shakespeare collaborated with his contemporary John Fletcher on at least three plays, one of which, *Cardenio*, derives its story from an intercalated story in Part I of *Don Quixote*. Of those three collaborations, *Cardenio* is the only one not printed in either quarto or folio format. The previous existence of such a play demonstrates Shakespeare's knowledge of Cervantes, and, if a manuscript copy were uncovered, it would propel a discussion of Shakespeare as a reader of Cervantes. For the moment, we need to content ourselves with a comparative study of their characters as readers and the interpretive communities to which they belong. By doing so, we begin to destabilize our own interpretive communities, those that compel us to read Shakespeare or Cervantes in particular (and particularly scholarly) ways. I think both men would be pleased.

REFERENCES

- Aebischer, Pascale. "Titus Andronicus: Spectacular Obscenities." *Shakespeare's Violated Bodies*. Cambridge UP, 2004. pp. 24-63.
- Baker, Edward. *La biblioteca de don Quijote*. Marcial Pons Historia, 2015.
- Bandera, Cesáreo. "Cervantes frente a don Quijote: Violenta simetría entre la realidad y la ficción." *MLN*, vol. 89, no. 2, 1974, pp. 159-72.
- Bassnett, Susan. "Influence and Intertextuality: A Reappraisal." *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, vol. 43, no. 2, 2007, pp. 134-46.
- Berensmeyer, Ingo. "No Fixed Address: Pascal, Cervantes, and the Changing Function of Literary Communication in Early Modern Europe." *New Literary History*, vol. 34, no. 4, 2003, pp. 623-637.
- Bergeron, David M. "Reading and Writing in Shakespeare's Romances." *Criticism*, vol. 33, no. 1, 1991, pp. 91-113.
- Berry, Edward I. "Prospero's Brave Spirit." *Studies in Philology*, vol. 76, no.1, 1979, pp. 36-48.
- Bouza, Fernando. "Balumba de libros: biblioclasmo, cultura escrita, y buen gobierno en el memorial." *Bulletin of Spanish Studies*, vol. 81, no. 7, 2004, pp. 957-71.
- . *Communication, Knowledge, and Memory in Early Modern Spain*. U of Pennsylvania P, 1999.

- . "Los contextos materiales de la producción cultural." *España en tiempos del Quijote*.
Eds. Antonio Feros and Juan Gelabert. Taurus, 2004.
- Burke, Peter. *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe*. Harper & Row, 1978.
- Castillo, Antonio. "La escritura representada: imágenes de lo escrito en la obra de Cervantes." *Volver a Cervantes*. Ed. Antonio Bernat. Palma de Mallorca, 2001. pp. 311-25.
- Castro, A. "La palabra escrita y el *Quijote*." *Hacia Cervantes*, 1967, pp. 359-419.
- Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de. *El ingenioso hidalgo don Quijote de la Mancha I/II*.
Edited by Luis Andrés Murillo. 1ª ed. Barcelona: Castalia, 2011.
- Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de. *Don Quixote: The Ormsby Translation, Revised*. Edited by Joseph R. Jones and Kenneth Douglas. W.W. Norton & Company, 1981.
- Chartier, Roger. *The Author's Hand and the Printer's Mind*. Polity Press, 2014.
- . "The Press and Fonts: Don Quixote in the Print Shop." *Inscription and Erasure: Literature and Written Culture from the Eleventh to the Eighteenth Century*.
Translated by Arthur Goldhammer, U of Pennsylvania P, 2005.
- Cordua, Carla. "Voluntad de vencer y vencerse." *Revista Chilena de Literatura*, vol. 67, 2005, pp. 91-101.
- Corfield, Cosmo. "Why Does Prospero Abjure his 'Rough Magic'?" *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 36, no. 1, 1985, pp. 31-48.
- Covarrubias, Sebastián Orozco de. *Tesoro de la lengua castellana*. 1611.
- Cozad, Mary Lee. "Cervantes and *Libros de entendimiento*." *Cervantes: Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America*, vol. 8, no. 2, 1988, pp. 152-182.

- Cruikshank, D.W. "'Literature' and the Book Trade in Golden-Age Spain." *The Modern Language Review*, vol. 73, no. 4, 1979, pp. 799-824.
- De Armas, Frederick A. "Reviewed Works: Comedias parte XI, tomos I-II by de Vega." *Renaissance Quarterly*, vol. 66, no. 3, 2013, pp. 1099-1101.
- De Sousa, Geraldo U. *Shakespeare's Cross-Cultural Encounters*. St. Martin's Press, Inc., 1999.
- Desmet, Christy. *Reading Shakespeare's Characters: Rhetoric, Ethics, and Identity*. U of Massachusetts P, 1992.
- Dobranski, Stephen B. *Readers and Authorship in Early Modern England*. Cambridge UP, 2005.
- Durán, Manuel and Fay R. Rigg. *Fighting Windmills: Encounters with Don Quixote*. Yale UP, 2006.
- Durrant, G.H. "Prospero's Wisdom." *Theoria: A Journal of Social and Political Theory*. no. 7, 1955, pp. 50-8.
- Eaton, Sara. "A Woman of Letters: Lavinia in *Titus Andronicus*." *Shakespearean Tragedy and Gender*. Eds. Shirley Nelson Garner and Madelon Sprengnether. Indiana UP, 1996. pp. 54-74.
- Echevarría, Roberto González. *Cervantes' Don Quixote*. Yale UP, 2015.
- Eisenberg, Daniel. "Cisneros y la quema de los manuscritos granadinos." *Journal of Hispanic Philology*, vol. 16, 1992, 107-24.
- Eisenstein, Elizabeth. *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge UP, 2005.

- Escudero, José Antonio. "El Quijote y la Inquisición." *Estudios sobre la Inquisición*. Marcial Pons Historia, 2005.
- Fawcett, Mary Laughlin. "Arms/Words/Tears: Language and the Body in *Titus Andronicus*." *ELH*, vol. 50, no. 2, 1983, pp. 261-77.
- Fish, Stanley. *Is There a Text in this Class?* Harvard UP, 1980.
- Ford, Wyn. "The Problem of Literacy in Early Modern England." *History*, vol. 78, no. 252, 1993, pp. 22-37.
- Friedman, Edward H. "Books Errant: The Objects of Invention in *Don Quixote*." *Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations: Miguel de Cervantes's Don Quixote*. Ed. Harold Bloom. Infobase Publishing, 2010.
- . "Reading Redressed: or, The Media Circuits of *Don Quijote*." *Confluencia*, vol. 2, no. 9, 1994, pp. 38-51.
- Gacto Fernández, Enrique. "Sobre la censura literaria en el s. XVII: Cervantes, Quevedo y la Inquisición." *Revista de la Inquisición*, vol. 1, 1991, pp. 11-62.
- Gilman, Stephen. "Los inquisidores literarios de Cervantes." *Actas del Tercer Congreso Internacional de Hispanistas*, 1970, pp. 3-25.
- . *The Novel According to Cervantes*. U of California P, 1989.
- Giorno, Gabriella T. "The Reflected Tempest and Prospero's 'Calling Word'." *Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies*, vol. 11, no. 1, 2005, pp. 203-10.
- Godoy Gallardo, Eduardo. "Presencia y sentido de Sansón Carrasco." *Revista Chilena de Literatura*, no. 67, 2005, pp. 53-67.

- Gowing, Laura. "Women's Bodies and the Making of Sex in Seventeenth-Century England." *Signs*, vol. 37, no. 4, 2012, pp. 813-22.
- Hart, Thomas R. "Deceit and Decorum in Cervantes." *The Modern Language Review*, vol. 90, no. 2, 1995, pp. 370-376.
- Hawkes, Terence. *Meaning by Shakespeare*. Routledge, 1992.
- Hulse, S. Clark. "Wresting the Alphabet: Oratory and Action in *Titus Andronicus*." *Criticism*, vol. 21, no. 2, 1979, pp.106-18.
- Hur, Myung-soo. "'Vengeance Rot You All!' Blood-Oriented Revengers in *Titus Andronicus*." *Shakespeare's Theories of Blood, Character, and Class*. Ed. Peter C. Rollins and Alan Smith. P. Lang, 2001. pp. 131-62.
- Irigoyen-García, Javier. "El debate estético en el 'donoso escrutinio' del *Quijote*." *Anuario de estudios cervantinos*, vol. 3, 2007, pp. 201-16.
- Iser, Wolfgang. *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Johns Hopkins UP, 1978.
- . *Prospecting: From Reader Response to Literary Anthropology*. Johns Hopkins UP, 1989.
- Johns, Adrian. *The Nature of the Book*. U of Chicago P, 1998.
- Kaestle, Carl F. "The History of Literacy and the History of Readers." *Review of Research in Education*, vol. 12, 1985, pp. 11-53.
- Kahn, Coppélia. "The Daughter's Seduction in *Titus Andronicus*, or, Writing is the Best Revenge." *Roman Shakespeare: Warriors, Wounds, Women*. Routledge, 1997.
- Kamen, Henry. *Philip of Spain*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1997.
- Kermode, Frank. *Shakespeare: The Final Plays*. Longman's Green, 1963.

- Leggatt, Alexander. *Shakespeare's Tragedies: Violation and Identity*. Cambridge UP, 2005.
- Leininger, Lorie Jerrell. "The Miranda Trap: Sexism and Racism in Shakespeare's *Tempest*." *The Woman's Part: Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare*. Edited by Carolyn Ruth Swift Lenz, Gayle Green, and Carol Thomas Neely. U of Illinois P, 1980.
- Lerner, Isaías. "Quijote, segunda parte: parodia e invención." *Nueva revista de Filología Hispánica*, vol. 38, no. 2, 1990, pp. 817-36.
- Limpár, Ildikó. "Shakespeare's Miranda: Angelic or Demonic?" *Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies (HJEAS)*, vol. 9, no. 1, 2003, pp. 53-60.
- Lindenbaum, Peter. "Prospero's Anger." *The Massachusetts Review*, vol. 25, no. 1, 1984, pp. 161-171.
- Longres, María Isabel. "Don Quijote y Próspero: lecturas, lectores leídos y el poder de la imaginación." *Humanidades*, no. 2, 2017, pp. 103-15.
- López Estrada, Francisco. "La función de la biblioteca en el 'Quijote'." *De libros y bibliotecas: homenaje a Rocio Caracuel*, 1994, pp. 193-200.
- Lucía Megías, José Manuel. "Libros de caballerías castellanos: textos y contextos." *Edad de Oro*, vol. 21, 2002, pp. 9-60.
- Malfatti, Sarah. "The Book-Reader Relationship in Golden-Age Spain: Reading Practices and the Publishing Industry in *Don Quixote*." *A Maturing Market: The Iberian Book World in the First Half of the Seventeenth Century*. Edited by Alexander S. Wilkinson and Alejandra Ulla Lorenzo, Brill, 2017, pp. 87-100.

- Marchant, Alicia. *Literatura e historia de la cultura escrita: practicas bibliófilas y escriturarias en El Quijote de Cervantes*. Universidad de Málaga, 2003.
- Mason, Virginia, and Alden T. Vaughan. *Critical Essays on Shakespeare's The Tempest*. Prentice Hall International, 1998.
- McLuhan, Marshall. *The Gutenberg Galaxy*. U of Toronto P, 2011.
- Miola, Robert S. *Shakespeare's Reading*. Oxford UP, 2000.
- Moll, Jaime. *De la imprenta al lector: estudios sobre el libro español de los siglos XVI al XVII*. ARCO, 1994.
- Nabokov, Vladimir. *Lectures on Don Quixote*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1983.
- Nalle, Sara T. "Literacy and Culture in Early Modern Castile." *Past & Present*, no. 125, 1989, pp. 65-96.
- Norton, F.J. *Printing in Spain 1501-1520*. Cambridge UP, 1966.
- O'Neill, John. "The Printing of the Second Part of *Don Quijote* and *Ocho comedias*: Evidence of a Late Change in Cervantes's Attitude to Print and of Concurrent Production as Practised by both Author and Printers." *The Library: The Transactions of the Bibliographical Society*, vol. 16, no. 1, 2015, pp. 3-23.
- Osterc, Ludovic. "El escrutinio de la biblioteca de don Quijote y la crítica conservadora." *Acta neophilologica*, vol. 31, 1998, pp. 57-64.
- Packard, Bethany. "Lavinia as Coauthor of Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, vol. 50, no. 2, 2010, pp. 281-300.
- Parr, James A. "On the Rhetoric Within and Without *Don Quixote*." *Cervantes: Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America*, vol. 26, no. 1, 2008, pp. 219-235.

- Peña, Manuel. "El donoso y grande escrutinio o las caras de la censura." *Hispania*, vol. 65, no. 3, 2005, pp. 939-56.
- . *Escribir y prohibir: Inquisición y censura en los Siglos de Oro*. Cátedra, 2015.
- Petry, Alice Hall. "Knowledge in *The Tempest*." *Modern Language Studies*, vol. 11, no. 1, 1981, pp. 27-32.
- Powers, Perry J. "Varieties of Experience in *Don Quixote*." *The Journal of General Education*, vol. 4, no. 4, 1950, pp. 287-99.
- Prendergast, Ryan. "Inquisitorial Theatrics and Errant Subjects in *Don Quixote*." *Modern Language Studies*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 8-25.
- Presburg, Charles. "'This is Not a Prologue': Paradoxes of Historical and Poetic Discourse in the Prologue of *Don Quixote* Part I." *MLN*, vol. 110, no. 2, 1995, pp. 215-39.
- Prince, Gerald. *A Dictionary of Narratology*. U of Nebraska P, 2003.
- Reed, Corey A. "Scientific and Technological Imagery in *Don Quixote*." *Approaches to Teaching Cervantes's Don Quixote*. Edited by James A. Parr and Lisa Vollendorf, MLA, 2015.
- Richter, David F. "Don Quixote's Demise: Games, Cruelty, and the Closure of Representation on the Ducal Stage." *Confluencia*, vol. 25, no. 2, 2010, pp. 43-55.
- Riffaterre, Michael. *Essais de stylistique structurale*. Flammarion, 1971.
- Roberts, Sasha. "Reading in Early Modern England: Contexts and Problems." *Critical Survey*, vol. 12, no. 2, 2000, pp. 1-16.
- Rodríguez González, Ángel. "Realidad, ficción, y juego en El Quijote: *locura-cordura*." *Revista chilena de literatura*, vol. 67, 2005, pp. 161-75.

- Romero, Ángel. "Escrutinio de donosos escrutinios: Estela de los biblioclaustos generados por un capítulo de *Don Quijote*." *Espéculo*, vol. 29, 2005, pp. 1-37.
- Sanchez, Melissa E. "Seduction and Service in *The Tempest*." *Studies in Philology*, vol. 105, no. 1, 2008, pp. 50-82.
- Sanders, Eve Rachele and Margaret W. Ferguson. "Literacies in Early Modern England." *Critical Survey*, vol. 14, no. 1, 2002, pp. 1-8.
- Scott, Charlotte. "'Rather like a dream than an assurance': *The Tempest* and the Book of Illusions." *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Book*. Oxford UP, 2007.
- Serés, Guillermo. "La realidad histórica en la Segunda parte del *Quijote*." *Guaraguao*, vol. 9, no. 21, 2005, pp. 21-34.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Tempest*. Ed. Virginia Mason Vaughan and Alden T. Vaughan. The Arden Shakespeare, 1999.
- Shakespeare, William. *Titus Andronicus*. Ed. Jonathan Bate. The Arden Shakespeare, 1995.
- Shin, Hiewon. "Single Parenting, Homeschooling: Prospero, Caliban, Miranda." *Studies in English Literature*, vol. 48, no. 2, 2008, pp. 373-93.
- Sicroff, A.A. "La segunda muerte de don Quijote como respuesta de Cervantes a Avellaneda." *Nueva revista de Filología Hispánica*, vol. 24, no. 2, 1975, pp. 267-291.
- Skinner, John. "*Don Quixote* in 18th-Century England: A Study in Reader Response." *Cervantes: Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America*, vol. 7, no. 1, 1987, pp. 45-57.

- Slights, Jessica. "Rape and the Romanticization of Miranda." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, vol. 41, no. 2, 2001, pp. 357-79.
- Spiller, Elizabeth A. "Cervantes *avant la Lettre*: The Material Transformation of Romance and Reading Culture in *Don Quijote*." *Modern Language Quarterly*, vol. 60, no. 3, 1999, pp. 295-319.
- Starks-Estes, Lisa. "Shakespeare's Perverse Astraea, Martyr'd Philomel, and Lamenting Hecuba: Ovid, Sadomasochism, and Trauma in *Titus Andronicus*." *Violence, Trauma, and Virtus in Shakespeare's Roman Poems and Plays*. Palgrave MacMillan, 2014.
- Stock, Brian. "Toward Interpretive Pluralism: Literary History and the History of Reading." *New Literary History*, vol. 39, no. 3, 2008, pp. 389-413.
- Sturgiss, Marie H. "Shakespeare's Miranda." *The Shakespeare Association Bulletin*, vol. 10, no. 1, 1934, pp. 36-44.
- Thacker, Jonathan. "Reading *Don Quixote* in English Translation." *Approaches to Teaching Cervantes's Don Quixote*. Edited by James A. Parr and Lisa Vollendorf, MLA, 2015.
- Tricomi, Albert H. "The aesthetics of mutilation in *Titus Andronicus*." *Shakespeare and Language*. Ed. Catherine M.S. Alexander. Cambridge UP, 2004. pp. 226-39.
- Unamuno, Miguel de. *Vida de Don Quijote y Sancho*. Consejo Nacional de Cultura, 1963.
- Weber, William W. "'Worse than Philomel': Violence, Revenge, and Meta-Allusion in *Titus Andronicus*." *Studies in Philology*, vol. 112, no. 4, 2015, pp. 698-717.

Weiss, Julian. "What Every Noblewoman Needs to Know: Cultural Literacy in Late-Medieval Spain." *Speculum*, vol. 81, no. 4, 2006, pp. 1118-1149.

West, Grace Starry. "Going by the Book: Classical Allusions in *Titus Andronicus*." *Studies in Philology*, vol. 79, no. 1, 1982, pp. 62-77.

Williams, Carolyn D. "'Silence, like a Lucrece knife': Shakespeare and the Meanings of Rape." *The Yearbook of English Studies*, vol. 23, 1993, pp. 93-110.

APPENDIX A: SPANISH CITATIONS FROM DON QUIXOTE

Chapter One:

All of the below are found in *Don Quixote Part I*.

P25: “¡Desventurada de mí!, que me doy a entender, y así es ello la verdad como nací para morir, que estos malditos libros de caballerías que él tiene y suele leer tan de ordinario le han vuelto el juicio...Encomendados sean a Satanás y a Barrabás tales libros, que así han echado a perder el más delicado entendimiento que había en toda la Mancha.” (107)

P25-26: “...que muchas veces le aconteció a mi señor tío estarse leyendo en estos desalmados libros de desventuras dos días con sus noches, al cabo de los cuales arrojaba el libro de las manos, y ponía mano a la espada, y andaba a cuchilladas con las paredes, y cuando estaba muy cansado decía que había muerto a cuatro gigantes como cuatro torres, y el sudor que sudaba del cansancio decía que era sangre de las heridas que había recibido en la batalla...Mas yo me tengo la culpa de todo, que no avisé a vuestras mercedes de los disparates de mi señor tío, para que lo remediaran antes de llegar a lo que ha llegado, y quemaran todos estos descomulgados libros, que tiene muchos...” (107-108)

P28: rocíe este aposento, no esté aquí algún encantador de los muchos que tienen estos libros, y nos encanten, en pena de las que les queremos dar echándoles del mundo” (109)

P29: “...que andaba muy acertado en lo que deseaba y pedía, y que tal prosupuesto era propio y natural de los caballeros tan principales como el parecía y como su gallarda presencia mostraba; y que él, ansimesmo, en los años de su mocedad, se había dado a aquel honroso ejercicio, andando por diversas partes del mundo, buscando sus aventuras...” (88)

P31: ...no quiero irme con la corriente del uso, ni suplicarte casi con las lágrimas en los ojos, como otros hacen, lector carísimo, que perdones o disimules las faltas que en este mi hijo vieres, y ni eres su pariente ni su amigo, y tienes tu alma con tu cuerpo y tu libre albedrío como el más pintado, y estás en tu casa, donde eres señor della... Todo lo cual te esenta y hace libre de todo respecto y obligación, y así puedes decir de la historia todo aquello que te pareciere, sin temor que te calunien por el mal ni te premien por el bien que dijeres della. (50-51)

P31: ...sin temor que te calunien por el mal ni te premien por el bien que dijeres della. (51)

P32: ...vino a dar en el más estraño pensamiento que jamás dio loco en el mundo, y fue que le pareció conveniente y necesario, así para el aumento de su honra como para el servicio de su república, hacerse caballero andante, y irse por todo el mundo con sus armas y caballo a buscar las aventuras

P33: Con estas razones perdía el pobre caballero el juicio, y desvelábase por entenderlas y desentrenarlas el sentido, que no se lo sacara ni las entendiera el mismo Aristotles, si resucitara para sólo ello. No estaba muy bien con las heridas que don Belianís daba y recibía, porque se imaginaba que, por grandes maestros que le hubiesen curado, no dejaría de tener el rostro y todo el cuerpo lleno de cicatrices y señales. Pero, con todo,

alababa el su autor aquel acabar su libro con la promesa de aquella inacabable aventura, y muchas veces le vino deseo de tomar la pluma y dalle fin al pie de la letra, como allí se promete; y sin duda alguna lo hiciera, y aun saliera con ello, si otros mayores y continuos pensamientos no se lo estorbaran. (72)

P34: “La razón de la sinrazón que a mi razón se hace, de tal manera mi razón enflaquece, que con razón me quejo de la vuestra fermosura.” (72)

P35: En resolución, él se enfrascó tanto en su lectura, que se pasaban las noches leyendo de claro en claro, y los días de turbio en turbio; y así del poco dormir y del mucho leer se le secó el cerebro... Llenósele la fantasía de todo aquello que leía en los libros, así de encantamientos como de pendencias, batallas, desafíos, heridas, requiebros, amores, tormentas y disparates imposibles; y asentósele de tal modo en la imaginación que era verdad toda aquella máquina de aquellas sonadas invenciones que leía, que para él no había otra historia más cierta en el mundo. (73)

P35: ...muy acomodada condición para todo; que no era caballero melindroso ni tan llorón como su hermano, y que en lo de la valentía no le iba en zaga. (73)

P36: ...no estaban hechas de oír semejantes retóricas. (86)

P37: ...puesto caso que en las historias no se escribía, por haberles parecido a los autores dellas que no era menester escribir una cosa tan clara y tan necesaria de traerse como eran dineros y camisas limpias...(89)

P38: “Yo sé quién soy – respondió don Quijote -, y sé que puedo ser no sólo los que he dicho, sino todos los doce Pares de Francia, y aun todos los nueve de la Fama, pues a todas las hazañas que ellos todos juntos y cada uno por sí hicieron, se aventajarán las mías.” (106)

P44: tal era la gana que las dos tenían de la muerte de aquellos inocentes (109)

P47: “es el mejor de todos los libros que de este género se han compuesto” (111); “una cosa única y se haga para ello una caja” (115); “un tesoro de contento y una mina de pasatiempos...es éste el mejor libro del mundo” (117)

P48: “no merecen ser quemados, como los demás, porque no hacen ni harán el daño que los de caballerías han hecho; son libros de entendimiento, sin perjuicio de tercero” (118)

P50: ¿Qué aposento, o que nada, busca vuestra merced? Ya no hay aposento ni libros en esta casa, porque todo se lo llevó el mismo diablo” (124)

P50: “algunas veces le contradecía, y otras concedía, porque si no guardaba este artificio no había poder averiguarse con él” (125)

Chapter Two:

*Roman Numeral denotes the page in either Part I or Part II.

P52: ...la verdadera historia de mis famosos hechos...(I.80)

P56: “Una de las cosas,” dijo a esta sazón don Quijote, “que mas debe de dar contento a un hombre virtuoso y eminente es verse, viviendo, andar con buen nombre por las lenguas de las gentes, impreso y en estampa. Dije *con buen nombre*, porque siendo al contrario, ninguna muerte se le igualara.” (II.60)

P57: “que no ha sido sabio el autor de mi historia, sino algun ignorante hablador” (II.63)

P57: “Con todo eso,” respondió el bachiller, “dicen algunos que han leído la historia que se holgaran se les hubiera olvidado a los autores della algunos de los infinitos palos que en diferentes encuentros dieron al señor don Quijote.”

“Ahí entra la verdad de la historia,” dijo Sancho.

“También pudieran callarlos por equidad,” dijo don Quijote, “pues las acciones que ni mudan ni alteran la verdad de la historia no hay para qué escribirlas, si han de redundar en menosprecio del señor de la historia. (II.61)

P67: “Bueno es que quiera darme vuestra merced a entender que todo aquello que estos buenos libros dicen sea disparates y mentiras, estando impreso con licencia de los señores del Consejo Real, como si ellos fueran gente que habían de dejar imprimir tanta mentira junta y tantas batallas y tantos encantamientos que quitan el juicio.” (I.397)

P67: “que esto se hace para entretener nuestros ociosos pensamientos” (I.397)

P69: “Con todo eso,” dijo el don Juan, “será bien leerla, pues no hay libro tan malo, que no tenga alguna cosa buena.”

P69: Sumo fue el contento que los dos caballeros recibieron de oír cantar a don Quijote los estraños sucesos de su historia, y así quedaron admirados de sus disparates como del elegante modo con que los contaba. Aquí le tenían por discreto, y allí se les deslizaba por mentecato, sin saber determinarse que grado le darían entre la discreción y la locura.” (II.487)

P70: ...porque no son burlas las que duelen, ni hay pasatiempos que valgan si son con daño de tercero” (II.509)

P72: Entró dentro, con todo su acompañamiento, y vio tirar en una parte, corregir en otra, componer en ésta, enmendar en aquélla, y, finalmente, toda aquella máquina que en las ementas grandes se muestran. Llegábase don Quijote a un cajón y preguntaba qué era aquello que allí se hacía; dábanle cuenta los oficiales; admirábase, y pasaba adelante.

Llegó en otras a uno, y preguntóle qué era lo que hacía. (II.518)

P74: “Osaré yo jurar,” dijo don Quijote, “que no es vuesa merced concocido en el mundo, enemigo siempre de premiar los floridos ingenios ni los loables trabajos. ¡Qué de habilidades hay perdidas por ahí! ¡Qué de ingenios arrinconados! ¡Qué de virtudes menospreciadas! Pero, con todo eso, me parece que el traducir de una lengua en otra, como no sea de las reinas de las lenguas, griega y latina, es como quien mira los tapices flamencos por el revés, que aunque se ven las figuras, son llenas de hilos que las escurecen, y no se ven con la lisura y tez de la haz...” (II.519)

P76: “Bien parece que no sabe las entradas y salidas de los impresores, y las correspondencias que hay de unos a otros. Yo le prometo que cuando se vea cargado de dos mil cuerpos de libros, vea tan molido su cuerpo, que se espante, y más si el libro es un poco avieso y no nada picante.” (II.520)

P78: “Estos tales libros, aunque hay muchos deste género, son los que se deben imprimir, porque son muchos los pecadores que se usan, y son menester infinitas luces para tantos desalumbrados.” (II.520)

P79-80: “...ya conozco mi necedad y el peligro en que me pusieron haberlas leído; ya, por misericordia de Dios, escarmentando en cabeza propia, las abomino.” (II.588)

CURRICULUM VITAE

Erin S. O'Reilly

(256)655-3456, esorei01@louisville.edu
<https://www.linkedin.com/in/erin-s-oreilly>

P.O. Box 1131
Huntsville, AL 35807-0131

212 Bingham Humanities Building
University of Louisville,
Louisville, KY 40208

EDUCATION

Doctor of Philosophy - Comparative Humanities, The University of Louisville **2019**

Dissertation Title: "Reading the Readers: Analyses of Shakespearean and Cervantine Characters as (Dys)functional Readers."

Committee: Pamela Beattie, Julia Dietrich, Gregory Hutcheson (Chair), Hristomir Stanev

Graduate Certificate in Medieval and Renaissance Studies **2019**

Master of Arts - Spanish Literature, Purdue University **2014**

Bachelor of Arts - Spanish and Medieval Studies, The University of the South **2012**

Honors Thesis: Don Juan Manuel's *El Conde Lucanor*: A Convergence of Literary and Oral Traditions in Medieval Spain

RESEARCH INTERESTS

- Interdisciplinary researcher concerning Medieval and Early Modern Spain and England.
- The collected works of Miguel de Cervantes and their relevance in the twenty-first century.
- Creative ways of relating the sixteenth and twenty-first centuries, historical contexts of key texts written in those eras, and advocating their continued inclusion in curricula.
- The printed word in Early Modern Europe and the print vs. manuscript dynamic.
- The presence of anti-intellectualism in literature from the Middle Ages to the present day.
- Women cross-dressing as men in prose and dramatic literature spanning all time periods.

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

Doctoral Researcher

2017-2019

Department of Comparative Humanities, The University of Louisville

- Examined the literature of Miguel de Cervantes and William Shakespeare, analyzing their treatment of printed books in their respective works and the transition from scribal to print culture.
- Conducted primary source research at the Newberry Library in Chicago during a series of graduate student dissertation seminars, examining both manuscript and print texts

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Graduate Teaching Assistant

2017-present

Department of Comparative Humanities, The University of Louisville

- Taught two classes per semester and one five-week summer term beginning August, 2017
- Taught a survey of world literature and a course in ethnic diversity of America (descriptions below)
- Developed course syllabus, policies, and assignments
- Used instructional technology and active learning activities to enhance student interaction

Graduate Teaching Assistant

2012-2014

Department of Spanish and Portuguese, School of Languages and Cultures, Purdue University

- Taught Spanish 102 and 201, both courses in Spanish language, grammar, and conversation
- Planned lessons according to preset syllabus, graded papers and exams

COURSES TAUGHT

FOUR DIFFERENT COURSES, 13 INDIVIDUAL SECTIONS

University of Louisville

Cultures of America (3 sections): This freshman-level interdisciplinary course explores the arts and humanities within contemporary American cultures including, but not limited to, European, African, Hispanic, and indigenous cultures.

World Literature to 1700 (4 sections): This freshman-level literature survey introduces critical thinking about world cultures, using selected readings to examine historical backgrounds and contexts.

Purdue University

Spanish Level III (4 sections): Two-hundred-level language course that reviews grammar techniques covered in previous levels, applies them to conversational settings, and emphasizes writing skills.

Spanish Level II (2 sections): One-hundred-level language course focused on grammar and vocabulary retention, with emphasis in speaking practice and listening proficiency.

LANGUAGES

- **Spanish:** Fluent
- **Brazilian Portuguese:** Proficient

ORAL PRESENTATIONS

Conferences

- “‘I Am Just Against Bad Television’: Reading Cervantes Through *Fahrenheit 451*,” Louisville Conference on Literatures and Cultures Since 1900, University of Louisville. February 2018.
- “‘Denies My Tongue to Tell’: The Creation and Destruction of a Human Book in *Titus Andronicus*,” Multidisciplinary Graduate Student Conference. Newberry Library, Chicago, IL. January 2018.
- “Don Quijote, Sancho Panza, and Barataria: Populism in Spanish Golden Age Literature,” Kentucky Foreign Language Conference, University of Kentucky. April 2017.
- “Tradition vs. Progress: Female Oppression and Subversion in the Post-Civil War Spanish Novel,” Louisville Conference on Literatures and Cultures Since 1900, University of Louisville. February 2017.
- “Translation, Localization, Globalization: An Overview of International Technical Communication,” Rocket City Technical Communication Conference, University of Alabama in Huntsville. March 2015.

Guest Speaker

- “Don Quixote’s Printed Identity: The Printing Press as an Agent of Character Destabilization.” Medieval and Renaissance Workshop Talks, University of Louisville. October 2018.

EDUCATIONAL TRAVEL

- “2018 Dissertation Seminar for Scholars of the History of the Book in Medieval and Early Modern Europe,” Center for Renaissance Studies, Newberry Library, Chicago, IL.
 - October 5th, November 30th, 2018; February 22nd, April 26th, 2019
 - Participated to gain broader understanding of the book trade, pre and post-Gutenberg, from scholars in Medieval and Elizabethan England as part of my dissertation research.
- “Sewanee Semester in Spain”: Study abroad trip to Madrid, January-May, 2011
 - Spent four months in immersive language and culture-earning experience.
 - Took courses focused in twentieth-century Spain, language, and Muslim Spain’s history and art history.

HONORS AND AWARDS

- Outstanding Graduate Student Award, Department of Comparative Humanities, **2019**
University of Louisville
- Doctoral Dissertation Completion Award, University of Louisville **2019**
- Doctoral Fellowship, University of Louisville **2015-2017**

ACADEMIC SERVICE

Graduate Intern, The Future of Handwriting Symposium, University of Louisville.
April 2019

- Aided in event set-up and clean-up on the second day of the conference.
- Provided technical support to presenting panelists.

Peer Mentor, University of Louisville, 2018

- Provided mentorship to an incoming student in the Comparative Humanities Doctoral program

Panel Moderator, Louisville Conference on Literatures and Cultures Since 1900.
February 2018

- Chaired two conference panels, introduced each speaker, and facilitated discussion.
- Panels moderated: "Temporality and Narrative Arcs in Twentieth-Century Literature," and "Writing, Editing, Art, and Activism."

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Spanish Language Interpreter, La Casita, Louisville, KY **2018-2019**

- Interpreted for Hispanic immigrants seeking legal advice for two hours, one day a week

Spanish Language Interpreter, Foreign Language Services, Huntsville, AL **2014-2015**

- Interpreted for cases in the Department of Human Resources, such as food stamp applications, throughout North Alabama

OTHER EXPERIENCE

Coursework in Translation and Interpretation, University of Louisville **2017-2018**

- Took nine hours of graduate coursework in Spanish translation and interpretation
- Courses centered on translation theory, literary translations in both English and Spanish, interpretation practice and methods, and training in consecutive and simultaneous interpretation

Coursework in Technical Writing, University of Alabama in Huntsville **2014-2015**

- Took six hours of graduate coursework in technical communication, writing, and editing
- Learned mechanics of technical documents, reviewed editing methods, wrote book reviews

News Editor, *The Sewanee Purple*, Sewanee: The University of the South 2010

- Section editor for the university newspaper; edited all articles that fell under “News” category
- Worked closely with the Editor-in-Chief and Assistant Editor to confirm the quality of articles met paper’s standards, and ensure the paper kept to schedule.